arXiv:0710.0654v2 [math.PR] 18 Mar 2008

Steady-state analysis of a multi-server queue in the Halfin-Whitt regime

David Gamarnik[a*] Petar Momčilović[b]

[a]Operations Research Center and Sloan School of Management, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139; gamarnik@mit.edu

[b] EECS Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; petar@eecs.umich.edu

Abstract

We consider a multi-server queue in the Halfin-Whitt regime: as the number of servers n grows without a bound, the utilization approaches 1 from below at the rate $\Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$. Assuming that the service time distribution is lattice-valued with a finite support, we characterize the limiting stationary queue length distribution in terms of the stationary distribution of an explicitly constructed Markov chain. Furthermore, we obtain an explicit expression for the critical exponent for the moment generating function of a limiting (scaled) steady-state queue length. This exponent has a compact representation in terms of three parameters: the amount of spare capacity and the coefficients of variation of inter-arrival and service times. Interestingly, it matches an analogous exponent corresponding to a single-server queue in the conventional heavy-traffic regime.

Keywords: Multi-server queue, heavy-traffic approximation, Halfin-Whitt (QED) regime
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60K25, Secondary 90B22.

1 Introduction

In their seminal paper [22] Halfin and Whitt formally introduced an unconventional heavy traffic regime for queueing models. Unlike the traditional heavy traffic approach, in their regime (dubbed thereafter the Halfin-Whitt regime) high utilization is achieved by simultaneously increasing the arrival rate *and* the number of servers n. This regime is also reffered to as Quality- and Efficiency-Driven (QED) since it balances between the system utilization and quality of service perceived by customers; the steady-state queue length and waiting time scale respectively as $O(\sqrt{n})$ and $O(1/\sqrt{n})$, in some appropriate sense [22]. Moreover, the QED regime can be understood as critical with respect to the probability of wait, i.e., the limiting stationary probability of wait is *strictly* in $(0, 1)$ in QED systems (the probabilities of wait 0 and 1 correspond to the quality-driven and efficiency-driven regimes, respectively). It should be noted that the QED regime was considered by Erlang [15] in the context of numerical steady-state analysis of M/M/n and M/M/n/n systems. An asymptotic analysis of the closely related Erlang loss function was carried out in [24]. A formal analysis of a queue with exponential service times in the QED regime was completed in [22] by Halfin and Whitt. They established the criticality of the probability of wait in terms of the square-root spare capacity rule, both in steady-state and transient regimes.

*Support from NSF grant CMMI-0726733 is gratefully acknowledged.

Queueing models in the QED regime have found applications primarily in the area of large-scale call and customer contact centers [1, 18]. Hence, a number of related models have been considered in the literature. Models with customer impatience relevant to call center management were studied in [16, 19, 41]. Approximations that take into account finiteness of buffers were introduced in [39, 40]. Revenue maximization and constraint satisfaction were considered in [2,3,11,30,32]. Optimal stochastic control of QED queues in various settings was examined in [5,6,23,37]. The problem of joint control and staffing was studied in [7,20]. Most of the aforementioned results assume exponential service times. This assumption significantly simplifies the analysis as one does not need to keep a track of residual service times. The literature on non-exponential service time distribution is limited. Phase-type service time distribution in the transient regime was considered in Puhalskii and Reiman [35]. The case of deterministic service times in the steady-state regime was considered in Jelenković et al. [25]. A more recent work by Mandelbaum and Momčilović [31] deals with the transient distribution of the virtual waiting time in the case of discrete service times with a finite support. A process-level limit for the G/GI/n queue for the case of general service time distributions was obtained recently by Reed [36].

In this paper we examine the stationary behavior of a GI/GI/n system in the Halfin-Whitt regime when the service times are lattice-valued and the support is finite. More specifically, we consider a sequence of first-come first-served queues indexed by the number of servers $n \to \infty$. The utilization in the nth system is $1-\beta/\sqrt{n}+o(1/\sqrt{n})$ for some parameter $\beta > 0$; equivalently, the number of servers n is $R_n+\beta\sqrt{R_n}+o(\sqrt{R_n})$, where R_n is the offered load of the nth system. The service distribution does not change with n. The stationary number of customers and waiting time in the nth system are denoted by Q^n and W^n, respectively. The first main result of the paper states the existence of limiting random variables $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{W}$ such that $Q^n/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow \hat{Q}$ and $\sqrt{n}W^n \Rightarrow \hat{W}$, as $n \to \infty$. The distribution of $\hat{Q}$ is shown to correspond to the unique stationary distribution of some underlying continuous-state Markov chain $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$, where $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is limiting process corresponding to the vector of customers in different stages of service. Our second main result identifies the exact exponential decay rate of the limiting variable $\hat{Q}$. Informally, we show that $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Q} > x] \approx \exp\{-2\beta x/(c_a^2 + c_s^2)\}$ for large x, where c_a is the (limiting) coefficient of variation of interarrival times and c_s is the coefficient of variation of service times. Our analysis uses quadratic and geometric Lyapunov functions to establish the tightness of sequences $\{Q^n/\sqrt{n}, n \geq 1\}$ and $\{\sqrt{n}W^n, n \geq 1\}$.

Next we list some notational conventions used throughout the paper. For two vectors $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ with elements x_i and y_i, respectively, $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{y}$ denotes the dot product $\sum_i x_i y_i$. All considered vectors are row vectors, and transposition of a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ is denoted by $\boldsymbol{x}^T$. Let $\boldsymbol{K} \triangleq (1, 2, \ldots, K)$. For $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|$ denotes the L_1-norm: $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| = \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i|$. Denote by $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}^K \to \mathbb{R}^K$ a linear operator defined by

$$\mathcal{T}\{(x_1, \ldots, x_K)\} = (x_2, \ldots, x_K, 0).$$

For $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued random variables $\Rightarrow$ denotes the convergence in distribution. Given a random variable (r.v.) $X \in \mathbb{R}$, its moment generating function is $M_X(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}e^{\theta X}$. For every $\theta > 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ the family of sequences of r.v.s $\{X^n, n \geq 1\}$ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} M_{X^n}(\theta) < \infty$; let $\mathcal{M}_\infty = \cap_{\theta>0}\mathcal{M}_\theta$. Given a r.v. X, we write $X \in \mathcal{M}_\theta$ ($X \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$) if $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta X} < \infty$ ($\mathbb{E}e^{\theta X} < \infty$ for every $\theta > 0$). We denote by $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\cdot]$ the expectation operator with respect to a probability measure π; similarly, we use $\mathbb{P}_\pi[\cdot]$ when the probability measure π is not clear from the context. For two reals x, y we set $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$, $x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$, $x^+ = x \vee 0$ and $x^- = (-x)^+$; when

the argument of a unary operation is a vector or matrix it is understood that the operator is applied element-wise. Symbols $\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_+$ denote nonnegative integers and reals, respectively.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we describe the considered model and formally introduce the Halfin-Whitt (QED) regime. Our main results are stated in Section 3. Section 4 contains preliminary results. The proofs of the main results can be found in Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8.

2 Model

2.1 Queueing system description

We consider a sequence of first-come first-served queues indexed by the number of servers n. The details of our model are as follows.

Service times. Service times are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) r.v.s, equal in distribution to a r.v. S that does not depend on n and takes values in a finite set $\{s_1, \ldots, s_K\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. It is assumed that the set of service time values has a common divisor $s > 0$, i.e., $s_i = k_i s$ for some $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \le i \le K$. Under this assumption, without loss of generality, we adopt $s = 1$ to be the largest common divisor of service time values. Let $p_i \triangleq \mathbb{P}[S = i], 0 \le i \le K$, where K is the largest index such that $p_K > 0$. We assume $p_0 = 0$, that is no instantaneous service is possible. Then the expected service time is $\mu^{-1} \triangleq \mathbb{E}S = \sum_{i=1}^{K} i p_i$; the variance of S is denoted by σ_s and the coefficient of variation by $c_s = \mu\sigma_s$. The steady-state behavior of the system with deterministic service times ($S = 1$) has been characterized in [25] and, thus, we consider $\sigma_s > 0$. In this case there exist two values of the service time that are relatively prime, i.e., $p_i p_j > 0$ for some relatively prime $i \neq j$; otherwise a simple time change argument can be applied to re-scale service times. For convenience let $\boldsymbol{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_K)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} = (\tilde{p}_1, \ldots, \tilde{p}_K)$, where $\tilde{p}_i = \mathbb{P}[S \ge i] = \sum_{j \ge i} p_i$ describes the tail of the service time distribution.

Arrival times. Customers arrive to the nth system according to a stationary renewal process with interarrival times equal in distribution to τ_n. The arrival rate $\lambda_n \triangleq 1/\mathbb{E}\tau_n$ is such that $\lambda_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ while the coefficient of variation $c_{a,n}$ of interarrival times satisfies $c_{a,n} \to c_a$ as $n \to \infty$ for some $0 \le c_a < \infty$. In view of the assumption $S \in \mathbb{N}$ ($s = 1$), it is convenient to define A_t^n, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, as the number of arrivals in the time interval $(t-1, t]$ in the nth system. In addition, let a_t^n denote the backward recurrence time of the arrival process at time t, i.e., $a_t^n \triangleq \inf\{u > 0 : A_{t-u,t}^n > 0\}$, where $A_{s,t}^n$ denotes the number of arrivals in the time interval $(s, t]$ for two reals $s < t$. Our proving method is based on an analysis of a time-embedded process that has a Markov property. Hence, we require that the arrival process has limited dependency in its structure. To this end, it is assumed that the appropriately scaled number of arrivals, conditioned on the particular value of the backward recurrence time a, converges to a Gaussian distribution *uniformly* in a, i.e., for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sup_{a \ge 0} \left| \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{A_t^n - \lambda_n}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \le x \,\middle|\, a_{t-1}^n = a \right] - \mathbb{P}[A \le x] \right| \to 0, \tag{1}$$

as $n \to \infty$, where A is normally distributed with zero mean and variance c_a^2. Additionally we assume that (since convergence in distribution does not necessarily imply the convergence of

moments) that

$$\sup_{a\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A_t^n-\lambda_n}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\,\middle|\, a_{t-1}^n=a\right]\to 0, \tag{2}$$

as $n\to\infty$, and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{a\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{A_t^n-\lambda_n}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\right)^2\,\middle|\, a_{t-1}^n=a\right]<\infty. \tag{3}$$

There exists a broad class of arrival processes that satisfy these assumptions. The simplest one is the class of renewal processes with interarrival times that have uniformly in $a_t^n=a$ bounded conditional second moments. For example, let $\{\zeta_i, i\in\mathbb{Z}\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of nonnegative r.v.s with unit mean and a finite second moment. By setting ζ_i/λ_n to be the ith interarrival time in the nth process we obtain a process that satisfies the aforementioned assumptions due to the Central Limit Theorem for renewal processes [14, p. 114] when $\lambda_n\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$.

Finally, since we consider multi-server queues in their steady states, the distribution of interarrival times should be such that the stationary distributions of all considered quantities exists and are unique (for all finite n). See comments at the beginning of Section 3 and [4, Ch. XII] for details.

Quantities of interest. The number of customers *awaiting service* in the nth queue at time t is denoted by Q_t^n and the *total* number of customers in the system is denoted by Y_t^n. The fact that $Y_t^n=n+Q_t^n$ when all servers are busy while $Q_t^n=0$ when at least one server is idle renders

$$Q_t^n=(Y_t^n-n)^+ \tag{4}$$

for every time instant t. Let $L_{t,k}^n$, $k=1,\dots,K$, be the number of customers in service with remaining service times in the interval $(k-1,k]$ at time t. Notation $\boldsymbol{L}_t^n=(L_{t,1}^n,\dots,L_{t,K}^n)$ renders $\|\boldsymbol{L}_t^n\|\leq n$, with strict equality corresponding to the case when at least one server is idle. The following identity then holds for all $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$:

$$Q_t^n(n-\|\boldsymbol{L}_t^n\|)=0. \tag{5}$$

Let $J_{t,k}^n$, $k=1,\dots,K$, be the number of customers with service requirement k that enter service during the time interval $(t-1,t]$; set $\boldsymbol{J}_t^n=(J_{t,1}^n,\dots,J_{t,K}^n)$. Thus, $\|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\|$ is the total number of customers that enter service during the time interval $(t-1,t]$ and

$$Q_{t+1}^n=Q_t^n+A_{t+1}^n-\|\boldsymbol{J}_{t+1}^n\|. \tag{6}$$

2.2 QED regime and scaling

The offered load in the nth system is λ_n/μ and, hence, the utilization is given by $\rho_n\triangleq\lambda_n/(n\mu)$. In the Halfin-Whitt (QED) regime the relationship between the utilization and number of servers satisfies

$$\sqrt{n}(1-\rho_n)\to\beta, \tag{7}$$

as $n \to \infty$, for some $\beta > 0$, or equivalently $n = \lambda_n/\mu + \beta\sqrt{\lambda_n/\mu} + o(\sqrt{\lambda_n/\mu})$ as $n \to \infty$. For notational simplicity we let β_n be a quantity satisfying $n = \lambda_n/\mu + \beta_n\sqrt{n}$, i.e.,

$$\beta_n = (n - \lambda_n/\mu)/\sqrt{n} \to \beta,$$

as $n \to \infty$. Under such a scaling, the following centered and scaled versions of r.v.s indexed by $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are of interest:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}_t^n &\triangleq (A_t^n - \lambda_n)/\sqrt{n}, \\
\hat{Q}_t^n &\triangleq Q_t^n/\sqrt{n}, \\
\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t^n &\triangleq (\boldsymbol{L}_t^n - \lambda_n\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}})/\sqrt{n}, \\
\hat{J}_t^n &\triangleq (\|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| - \lambda_n)/\sqrt{n}, \qquad (8) \\
\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n &\triangleq (\boldsymbol{J}_t^n - \|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\|\boldsymbol{p})/\sqrt{n},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\hat{Y}_t^n \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,i}^n + \hat{Q}_t^n = (Y_t^n - \lambda_n/\mu)/\sqrt{n}. \qquad (9)$$

Given these definitions, the counterparts of (4), (5) and (6) are

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{Q}_t^n = (\hat{Y}_t^n - \beta_n)^+, \qquad (10) \\
&\hat{Q}_t^n \left(\beta_n - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,k}^n \right) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\hat{Q}_{t+1}^n = \hat{Q}_t^n + \hat{A}_{t+1}^n - \hat{J}_{t+1}^n, \qquad (11)$$

respectively.

3 Main results

A multi-server queue can be described by the standard Kiefer-Wolfowitz vector [26] of residual workloads, e.g., see [4, 8]. Provided the stability condition $\rho_n = \lambda_n/(n\mu) < 1$ is satisfied and the arrival process is renewal, in [26] it was established that all relevant stationary measures exist when the system is observed just before arrivals, i.e., stationary measures exists for this particular time-embedded process. In order to ensure the existence of stationary probabilities for continuous-time processes $\{(Q_t^n, \boldsymbol{L}_t^n), t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ and $\{W_t^n, t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ additional conditions are needed [4, p. 348]. We assume that these stationary distributions exists and are unique. Let π_n be the stationary probability law of $\{(\hat{Q}_t^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t^n), t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$, i.e., π_n is time invariant with respect to t. We characterize the limit of π_n as $n \to \infty$ in terms of the stationary probability of a certain discrete-time process $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t),\ t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. Although the processes $\{(\hat{Q}_t^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t^n), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ are inherently continuous-time, for the purposes of characterizing their stationary distributions it is sufficient to consider their time-embedded versions ($t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ due to the lattice-valued nature of service times $S \in \mathbb{N}$). Such an approach has an advantage since these discrete-time processes have a tractable Markovian structure that is amenable to the Lyapunov function method [33].

Next we construct the Markov chain $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ with state space $\mathbb{R}^{K+1}$. To this end, let $\{\hat{A}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of zero mean normal r.v.s with variance μc_a^2. Also let $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of normal random vectors with the zero mean and covariance matrix $\mu\Sigma$, elements of Σ defined by

$$\Sigma_{ij} = \begin{cases} (1-p_i)p_i, & 1 \le i = j \le K, \\ -p_i p_j, & 1 \le i \ne j \le K; \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

the sequences $\{\hat{A}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are independent. The process $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is defined by the following three recursions

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+1} = \mathcal{T}\{\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t\} + \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_{t+1} + \hat{J}_{t+1}\boldsymbol{p}, \tag{13}$$

$$\hat{Q}_{t+1} = \left(\hat{Q}_t + \hat{A}_{t+1} + \sum_{k=2}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,k} - \beta\right)^+, \tag{14}$$

$$\hat{J}_{t+1} = \left(\hat{Q}_t + \hat{A}_{t+1}\right) \wedge \left(\beta - \sum_{k=2}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,k}\right), \tag{15}$$

and an initial condition $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_0)$ that is independent of $\{\hat{A}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ and $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$; the random vector $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_0)$ satisfies $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{0,k} \le \beta$ and $\hat{Q}_0(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{0,k} - \beta) = 0$ by definition. It is straightforward to verify that the preceding defines a continuous-state Markov chain due to the i.i.d. nature of $\{\hat{A}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ and $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. Observe that (13), (14) and (15) imply, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,k} \le \beta$ and

$$\hat{Q}_t \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,k} - \beta\right) = 0.$$

We define a process $\{\hat{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ by $\hat{Y}_t = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{t,k} + \hat{Q}_t$ and note that it satisfies $\hat{Q}_t = (\hat{Y}_t - \beta)^+$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$; we often refer to this process as the limiting number of customers in the queue.

Our first main result states the existence of a distributional limit of $(\hat{Q}^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n)$, as $n \to \infty$, where the pair $(\hat{Q}^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n)$ is distributed according to π_n. In particular, we relate the sequence of stationary distributions $\{\pi_n, n \ge 1\}$ of $\{(\hat{Q}^n_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t), t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ to the stationary distribution of the discrete-time chain $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. The proof is based on a tightness argument and can be found in Section 5.

Theorem 1. *$\pi_n \Rightarrow \pi_*$ as $n \to \infty$, where π_* is the unique stationary distribution of the Markov chain $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$.*

Outline of the proof: The proof consists of three parts: (i) demonstrating that the sequence $\{(\hat{Q}^n_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t), n \ge 1\}$ is tight with respect to the sequence of distributions $\{\pi_n, n \ge 1\}$ (as $n \to \infty$), (ii) showing that the stationary distribution of $\{(\hat{Q}^n_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t), t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ converges to a stationary distribution of $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ as $n \to \infty$, and (iii) proving that $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ has a unique stationary distribution π_*. We briefly outline the main argument for (i), as the proofs of (ii) and (iii) follow more or less a standard argument.

A polynomial function $\Psi_\theta(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) = (\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{z})^\theta$ is defined, with $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{K^2}$ being fixed (Section 4.3); function Ψ_1 can take negative values. For notational simplicity let $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t =$

$(\hat{Y}^n_t, \ldots, \hat{Y}^n_{t-K+1})$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t = (\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t, \ldots, \hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_{t-K+1})$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t = \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}^n_t + \boldsymbol{p}\hat{A}^n_t$. Based on preliminary results (Sections 4.1 and 4.2) the following is derived (Section 4.3) for some set $\mathcal{R}^n$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}^n\} - \Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_{t-1})|\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_{t-1}\right] \leq -\delta\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_{t-1}) + \psi$$

for some $\delta > 0$, $\psi < \infty$ and all n large enough (Proposition 2), and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_{t-1} \in \mathcal{R}^n\}] < \infty$$

(Lemma 7). These two relationships can be combined (Theorem 13) to obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)] < \infty.$$

On the other hand, the expectation of the negative part of $\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)$ is also bounded in the limit (Lemma 9)

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[-\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)1\{\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t) < 0\}] < \infty.$$

Finally, the tightness of $\{\hat{Y}^n_t, n \geq 1\}$ (and hence of $\{\hat{Q}^n_t, n \geq 1\}$ since $\hat{Q}^n_t = (\hat{Y}^n_t - \beta)^+$) with respect to stationary $\{\pi_n, n \geq 1\}$ is due to $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\hat{Y}^n_t/\mu$. □

Let $(\hat{Q}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}})$ be distributed according to π_*, i.e., if Q^n is the stationary number of customers in the nth queue, then $Q^n/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow \hat{Q}$ as $n \to \infty$. It is immediate that $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Q} = 0] \in (0, 1)$ since the Gaussian term $\hat{A}_t$ in (13), (14) and (15) has infinite support. The convergence $\pi_n \Rightarrow \pi_*$ implies $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Q}^n = 0] \to \mathbb{P}[\hat{Q} = 0] \in (0, 1)$ as $n \to \infty$, and, thus, the system is indeed in the QED regime.

Our second result establishes the critical exponent for the moment generating function of $\hat{Q}$. The proof can be found in Section 6.

Theorem 2. *Let $\theta^* = 2\beta/(c_a^2 + c_s^2)$. Then $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\hat{Q}} < \infty$ if $\theta < \theta^*$ and $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\hat{Q}} = \infty$ if $\theta > \theta^*$.*

Outline of the proof: Here we outline just the proof of the statement $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\hat{Q}} < \infty$ if $\theta < \theta^*$. The key idea is to define a geometric Lyapunov function $\Phi_\theta(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) = \exp\{\theta\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \boldsymbol{y} + \theta\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{z}\}$ (Section 4.4) with $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{K^2}$ being fixed. Based on the rules according to which the number of customers in the system evolves (Section 4.2) it is possible to define a set $\mathcal{R}$ (Section 4.4) such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}\}|\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] \leq (1 - \delta)\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1})$$

for all $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$ and some $\delta < 1$ (Proposition 3), and $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*}[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \in \mathcal{R}\}] < \infty$ for $\theta > 0$ (Lemma 10). The preceding two inequalities are combined to conclude $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*}\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) < \infty$ for $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$ (Theorem 12) and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{p} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t\right\}\right] < \infty$$

follows since $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ and $\hat{A}_t$ are normally distributed by definition. Finally, the proof is concluded by showing that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*}\left[\exp\left\{\theta|\hat{Y}_t/\mu - \boldsymbol{p} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t|\right\}\right] < \infty$$

for all $\theta > 0$. □

The theorem is stated for the limiting queue length $\hat{Q}$. With additional conditions on the arrival processes a weaker result can be obtained for the pre-limit variables $\hat{Q}^n$ by only slightly modifying the proof of Theorem 2. Namely, it is needed that the arrival process satisfies

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{a\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\theta|\hat{A}^n_t|} \,\middle|\, a^n_{t-1} = a\right] \leq e^{c\theta^2} \tag{16}$$

for some $c < \infty$ and for every $\theta > 0$. Then, the following result is established by exploiting the preceding relationship.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that (16) holds. There exists $\theta > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}e^{\theta Q^n/\sqrt{n}} < \infty.$$

Proof. See Section 7. □

We conjecture that the threshold value of θ in Theorem 3 is given by θ^* (defined in Theorem 2). We remark that the criticality of the exponent $\theta^* = 2\beta/(c_a^2 + c_s^2)$ is consistent with the results obtained earlier in [22, 25]. Namely, in the GI/M/n queue in the QED regime the conditional limited scaled steady-state number of customers is exponentially distributed [22]

$$x^{-1} \log \mathbb{P}[\hat{Q} > x | \hat{Q} > 0] = -2\beta/(c_a^2 + 1),$$

$x > 0$, while for the QED GI/D/n queue [25] one has, as $x \to \infty$,

$$x^{-1} \log \mathbb{P}[\hat{Q} > x | \hat{Q} > 0] \to -2\beta/c_a^2;$$

recall that in both cases $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Q} > 0] \in (0, 1)$ for every $\beta > 0$. Furthermore, we point out that the same exponent θ^* appears in the Kingman approximation [27, 28] for a single-server queue in the conventional heavy-traffic regime. Moreover, the same exponent was established in analyses of queues with a fixed number of servers in the same heavy-traffic regime.

In particular, consider a sequence of *single*-server queues indexed by n. The arrival rate to the the nth system is $\lambda_n \to \infty$, with the arrival process being renewal, satisfying the Central Limit Theorem and $c_{a,n} \to c_a$ as $n \to \infty$. The service times of customers are i.i.d. and equal in distribution to S/n (equivalently, the service capacity grows linearly in n), and, thus, the utilization is given by $\rho_n = \lambda_n/(n\mu)$. Let $\tilde{Q}^n$ be the steady-state number of customers *awaiting service* in the system indexed by n; $\tilde{Q}^n$ and the total number of customers in the system differ by at most one at any point in time. If $\sqrt{n}(1 - \rho_n) \to \beta > 0$, as $n \to \infty$, then $\tilde{Q}^n/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow \tilde{Q}$, as $n \to \infty$, where $\tilde{Q}$ is exponentially distributed [38, Sect. 9.6] (see also [38, Sect. 5.7]):

$$x^{-1} \log \mathbb{P}[\tilde{Q} > x] = -\theta^*,$$

$x > 0$, where θ^* is as in Theorem 2. The agreement of the critical exponent θ^* in the corresponding single- and n-server ($n \to \infty$) systems is interesting since the two evolve under different rules. Observe that, as $n \to \infty$, the total number of customers in the single-server system is $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$, as $n \to \infty$, while for the n-server system that quantity is $\Theta(n)$, as $n \to \infty$.

In conclusion of this section we obtain an analogue of Theorem 2 for waiting times using the Distributional Little's Law [21] applied to the waiting room. In the case of process-level (transient) analysis a result of [34] (see also [35, Lemma A.2]) is utilized typically to make a "translation" between the queue length and waiting time processes. Here we provide a simple independent proof for the stationary waiting time W^n.

Corollary 1. *If* $\hat{W} \triangleq \mu^{-1}\hat{Q}$ *then* $\sqrt{n}W^n \Rightarrow \hat{W}$ *as* $n \to \infty$. *Consequently,* $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\hat{W}} < \infty$ *if* $\theta < \mu\theta^*$ *and* $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\hat{W}} = \infty$ *if* $\theta > \mu\theta^*$.

Proof. See Section 8. □

4 Preliminary results

The section contains 4 subsections. In the first subsection we consider a time-embedded version of $\{(\hat{Q}^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t), t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$. The number of customers in the finite-n and limiting systems is considered in the second subsection. Quadratic and geometric Lyaponov functions are introduced and analyzed in the last two subsections.

4.1 Time-embedded process

In this section we examine the triple $(Q^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t, a_t) \in \mathbb{Z}^{K+1}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and the laws governing its evolution in time. The process $\{(Q^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t, a^n_t),\, t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ is not Markovian due to the non-exponential nature of service times. Hence, in order to avoid enlarging the state space, we consider its time-embedded version $\{(Q^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t, a^n_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$, i.e., the original process observed at discrete-time instances $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ (recall from Section 2.1 that $S \in \mathbb{N}$). As seen in the following proposition, the evolution of the later process is determined by the number of arrivals (A^n_t) and customers that enter service $(\boldsymbol{J}^n_t)$ during a unit time interval.

Proposition 1. *The process* $\{(Q^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t, a^n_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ *is a Markov chain. For every* $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ *the value of* $(Q^n_{t+1}, \boldsymbol{L}^n_{t+1})$ *satisfies*

$$\boldsymbol{L}^n_{t+1} = \mathcal{T}\{\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\} + \boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}, \tag{17}$$

$$Q^n_{t+1} = \left(Q^n_t + A^n_{t+1} + \|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\| - n - L^n_{t,1}\right)^+, \tag{18}$$

where $\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^K_+$ *is a multinomially distributed random vector that obeys*

$$\|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\| = \left(Q^n_t + A^n_{t+1}\right) \wedge (n - \|L^n_{t,k}\| + L^n_{t,1}) \tag{19}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1} \,|\, \|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\|] = \|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\|\, \boldsymbol{p}; \tag{20}$$

given $\|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\|$ *vector* $\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}$ *is conditionally independent of* $\{(Q^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t, a^n_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$.

Proof. It is sufficient to demonstrate (17), (18) and (19); equality (20) is a straightforward consequence of the i.i.d. nature of service times. The Markov property follows from these relationships and the renewal structure of the arrival process.

Consider the number of customers that enter service in the time interval $(t, t+1]$. At time t there are $\|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\|$ customers in service by the definition of $\boldsymbol{L}^n_t$. Out of these $\|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\|$ customers, $L^n_{t,1}$ depart from the system not later than time $(t+1)$ since their residual service requirements at time t are at most 1 (by the definition of $L^n_{t,1}$). This yields that $n - \|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\| + L^n_{t,1}$ customers can potentially enter service in the time interval $(t, t+1]$; recall that $n - \|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\|$ is the number of idle servers at time t. On the other hand, the number of customers that can enter service in $(t, t+1]$ is at most $Q^n_t + A^n_{t+1}$. Thus, the number of customers that enter service in $(t, t+1]$ is

$$\|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\| = (Q^n_t + A^n_{t+1}) \wedge (n - \|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\| + L^n_{t,1}), \tag{21}$$

rendering (19). Now, customers in service at time $t+1$ with residual service requirements in $(i-1,i]$ are of two types: (i) customers already in service at time t, and (ii) customers that do enter service in $(t,t+1]$. Thus, formally

$$L^n_{t+1,i} = \begin{cases} L^n_{t,i+1} + J^n_{t+1,i}, & i = 1,\dots,K-1, \\ J^n_{t+1,i}, & i = K. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

The multinomial distribution of $\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}$ follows from the assumption that customers' service requirements are i.i.d. r.v.s, independent from the arrival processes. Rewriting (22) in a vector form renders (17).

In order to establish the value of Q^n_{t+1}, it is sufficient to consider the difference between the number of customers that could start receiving service in the time interval $(t,t+1]$ and the actual number of customers that enter service, i.e., (6) and (21) yield

$$\begin{aligned} Q^n_{t+1} &= (Q^n_t + A^n_{t+1}) - \|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\| \\ &= (Q^n_t + A^n_{t+1} + \|\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\| - L^n_{t,1} - n)^+, \end{aligned}$$

and (18) holds. This concludes the proof. □

An analogue of Proposition 1 for scaled processes is stated next.

Corollary 2. *The process* $\{(\hat{Q}^n_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t, a^n_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ *is a Markov chain and it satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_{t+1} &= \mathcal{T}\{\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t\} + \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}^n_{t+1} + \hat{J}^n_{t+1}\boldsymbol{p}, \\ \hat{Q}^n_{t+1} &= \left(\hat{Q}^n_t + \hat{A}^n_{t+1} + \sum_{i=2}^{K} \hat{L}^n_{t,i} - \beta_n\right)^+, \\ \hat{J}^n_{t+1} &= \left(\hat{Q}^n_t + \hat{A}^n_{t+1}\right) \wedge \left(\beta_n - \sum_{i=2}^{K} \hat{L}^n_{t,i}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}^n_{t+1}$ *conditional on* $\hat{J}^n_{t+1}$ *is independent of* $\{(\hat{Q}^n_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t, a^n_t),\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$.

Proof. The Markov property follows from Proposition 1 and the fact that there exists a one-to-one mapping between $(\hat{Q}^n_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_t)$ and $(Q^n_t, \boldsymbol{L}^n_t)$. Now, (17) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{L}^n_{t+1} - \lambda_n\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} &= \mathcal{T}\{\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\} + \boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1} - \lambda_n\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \\ &= (\mathcal{T}\{\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\} - \lambda_n(\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} - \boldsymbol{p})) + \left(\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1} - \|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\|\boldsymbol{p}\right) + \left(\|\boldsymbol{J}^n_{t+1}\| - \lambda_n\right)\boldsymbol{p}. \end{aligned}$$

This equality and the observation $\mathcal{T}\{\boldsymbol{L}^n_t - \lambda_n\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}\} = \mathcal{T}\{\boldsymbol{L}^n_t\} - \lambda_n(\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} - \boldsymbol{p})$ (due to the definition of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}$) yield (23). The remaining relationships are obtained similarly from their counterparts (18) and (19). □

Properties of the vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}^n_t$ are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *Vector* $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ *satisfies for every* $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ *and* $\theta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, \|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| = k\right] &= k\sigma_s^2/n,\\
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{J}_{t,j}^n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, \|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| = k\right] &= kp_j(1-p_j)/n,\\
\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right\} \,\middle|\, \|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| = k\right] &= \left(\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\frac{S-1/\mu}{\sqrt{n}}}\right)^k\\
&\leq \left(\mathbb{E}e^{\theta\frac{S-1/\mu}{\sqrt{n}}}\right)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a sequence of i.i.d. r.v.s equal in distribution to S. Then, the definition of $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ renders

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, \|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| = k\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{S_i - 1/\mu}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2\\
&= k\sigma_s^2/n.
\end{aligned}$$

The other two equalities are obtained in a similar straightforward fashion. The inequality is due to $\mathbb{E}e^{\theta(S-1/\mu)/\sqrt{n}} \geq 1$. This follows from the convexity of $e^{\theta(x-1/\mu)/\sqrt{n}}$ in x and Jensen's inequality. □

4.2 Number in system

This section is devoted to the detailed analysis of the rescaled number of customers in the system $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ and its limiting counterpart. The dynamics of $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is related to a newly introduced process

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n = (\hat{Z}_{t,1}^n, \ldots, \hat{Z}_{t,K}^n) \triangleq \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n + \boldsymbol{p}\hat{A}_t^n \tag{24}$$

and in particular to

$$\hat{V}_t^n \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=i}^K (\hat{J}_{t+1-i,j}^n + p_j\hat{A}_{t+1-i}^n), \tag{25}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=i}^K \hat{Z}_{t+1-i,j}^n, \tag{26}$$

as stated in the next lemma. Informally, for large n, process $\{\hat{V}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ serves as a proxy for a scaled infinite-server process. We remark that the lemma is a discrete-time analogue of (1.1) in [36].

Lemma 5. *The process* $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ *satisfies for all* $t \geq K$

$$\hat{Y}_t^n = \hat{V}_t^n + \sum_{i=1}^K p_i(\hat{Y}_{t-i}^n - \beta_n)^+.$$

Proof. Equalities (23) and (11) yield an expression for the Kth element of the vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_{t+1}$:

$$\hat{L}^n_{t+1,K} = \hat{J}^n_{t+1,K} + (\hat{A}^n_{t+1} + \hat{Q}^n_t - \hat{Q}^n_{t+1})p_K.$$

Furthermore, using (23) iteratively it is straightforward to obtain the remaining elements of $\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}^n_{t+1}$. To this end, for $j = 0, \ldots, K-1$,

$$\hat{L}^n_{t+1+j,K-j} = \sum_{i=0}^{j} \hat{J}^n_{t+1+i,K-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{j} (\hat{A}^n_{t+1+i} + \hat{Q}^n_{t+i} - \hat{Q}^n_{t+1+i})p_{K-i},$$

which after a change of time indices renders, for $t \geq K$ and $j = 1, \ldots, K$,

$$\hat{L}^n_{t,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{K+1-j} \hat{J}^n_{t+1-i,j+i-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{K+1-j} (\hat{A}^n_{t+1-i} + \hat{Q}^n_{t-i} - \hat{Q}^n_{t-i+1})p_{j+i-1}. \tag{27}$$

Summing both sides of (27) over $j = 1, \ldots, K$ and using (25) results in

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{K} \hat{L}^n_{t,j} &= \sum_{i=1}^{K}\sum_{j=i}^{K} \hat{J}^n_{t+1-i,j} + \sum_{i=1}^{K} (\hat{A}^n_{t+1-i} + \hat{Q}^n_{t-i} - \hat{Q}^n_{t-i+1})\tilde{p}_i \\ &= \hat{V}^n_t - \hat{Q}^n_t + \sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i \hat{Q}^n_{t-i}.\end{aligned}$$

The statement of the lemma follows from the preceding equality, (9) and (10). □

The following corollary establishes a lower and upper bound on the value of $\hat{Y}^n_t$ in terms of the past values of $\{\hat{Y}^n_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ and the process $\{\hat{V}^n_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$.

Corollary 3. *(i) For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $t \geq k + K$*

$$\hat{Y}^n_t \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} (\hat{V}^n_{t-i})^+ + \sum_{i=k+1}^{k+K} \tilde{p}_{i-k} (\hat{Y}^n_{t-i} - \beta_n)^+.$$

(ii) For $1 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_k \leq K$ let $p(k) = \prod_{j=1}^{k} p_{i_j}$ and $s(k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} i_j$ with $s(0) = 0$. Then for $t \geq s(k)$

$$\hat{Y}^n_t \geq p(k)\hat{Y}^n_{t-s(k)} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\beta - \hat{V}^n_{t-s(j)})^+.$$

Proof. The proofs of the two parts are by induction on k.

(i) The base of the induction ($k = 0$) is due to Lemma 5 and $\tilde{p}_i \geq p_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, K$. Then the bound follows from the inductive assumption, Lemma 5 and $\tilde{p}_i = p_i + \tilde{p}_{i+1} \leq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Y}^n_t &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} (\hat{V}^n_{t-i})^+ + (\hat{Y}^n_{t-k-1})^+ + \sum_{i=k+2}^{k+K} \tilde{p}_{i-k} (\hat{Y}^n_{t-i} - \beta_n)^+ \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (\hat{V}^n_{t-i})^+ + \sum_{i=k+2}^{k+1+K} \tilde{p}_{i-k-1} (\hat{Y}^n_{t-i} - \beta_n)^+.\end{aligned}$$

(ii) By Lemma 5 one has $\hat{Y}_t^n \geq \hat{V}_t^n + p_{i_1}(\hat{Y}_{t-i_1}^n - \beta)^+$ that implies

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Y}_t^n &\geq p_{i_1}\hat{Y}_{t-i_1}^n - (\beta - \hat{V}_t^n) \\ &\geq p_{i_1}\hat{Y}_{t-i_1}^n - (\beta - \hat{V}_t^n)^+. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The preceding inequality provides the base of the induction ($k = 1$). Suppose now that the statement of the corollary holds for some $k \geq 1$. Then combining (28), the inductive assumption and $p_i \leq 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Y}_t^n &\geq p(k)\hat{Y}_{t-s(k)}^n - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}(\beta - \hat{V}_{t-s(j)})^+ \\ &\geq p(k+1)\hat{Y}_{t-s(k+1)}^n - \sum_{j=0}^{k}(\beta - \hat{V}_{t-s(j)})^+, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is also due to $s(k+1) = s(k) + i_{k+1}$. □

In the rest of the section we state the limiting counterparts of the results derived for $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. We start by introducing the limiting analogs of $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n$ and $\hat{V}_t^n$. Define

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t \triangleq \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t + \boldsymbol{p}\hat{A}_t \tag{29}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_t &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{K}\sum_{j=i}^{K}\left(\hat{J}_{t+1-i,j} + p_j\hat{A}_{t+1-i}\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{K}\sum_{j=i}^{K}\hat{Z}_{t+1-i,j}, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\hat{Z}_{t,i}$'s are the elements of $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t$. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ and $\hat{A}_t$ are normal r.v.s by definition, $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t$ is normally distributed as well and for all t and i we have

$$|\hat{Z}_{t,i}| \in \mathcal{M}_\infty. \tag{31}$$

The properties of $\{\hat{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ are summarized in the following lemma, including a limiting counterparts of Lemma 5 and Corollary 3.

Lemma 6. *(i) The process $\{\hat{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ satisfies for all $t \geq K$*

$$\hat{Y}_t = \hat{V}_t + \sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i(\hat{Y}_{t-i} - \beta)^+.$$

(ii) For every $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$(-\hat{Y}_t) \in \mathcal{M}_\infty.$$

(iii) For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $t \geq k + K$

$$\hat{Y}_t \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k}(\hat{V}_{t-i})^+ + \sum_{i=k+1}^{k+K}\tilde{p}_{i-k}(\hat{Y}_{t-i} - \beta)^+.$$

(iv) For $1 \le i_1, \dots, i_k \le K$ *let* $p(k) = \prod_{j=1}^{k} p_{i_j}$ *and* $s(k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} i_j$ *with* $s(0) = 0$. *Then, for* $t \ge s(k)$

$$\hat{Y}_t \ge p(k)\hat{Y}_{t-s(k)} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\beta - \hat{V}_{t-s(j)})^+.$$

Proof. (i) The proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 5. Part (ii) follows from $\hat{Y}_t \ge \hat{V}_t$ (i) and the fact that $\hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ have normal distributions. The proofs of (iii) and (iv) are analogous to the proof of Corollary 3. □

4.3 Quadratic Lyapunov function

Here we introduce a quadratic Lyapunov function and prove some of its properties. To this end, we define K vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_K$, where elements of the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k = (\alpha_{k,1}, \dots, \alpha_{k,K})$ are defined by

$$\alpha_{k,j} = (j-k)^+; \tag{32}$$

let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_K) \in \mathbb{R}^{K^2}$. Let a function $\Psi_\theta(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) : \mathbb{R}^{K+K^2} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\Psi_\theta(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) \triangleq (\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{z})^\theta \tag{33}$$

and a set $\mathcal{R}_x$ by

$$\mathcal{R}_x \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^K : y_i < x \text{ for some } i\}. \tag{34}$$

The case $\theta = 2$ is of particular importance since it corresponds to a quadratic Lyapunov function (see Appendix B for the definition) as established below. Finally, we introduce $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n \triangleq (\hat{Y}_t^n, \dots, \hat{Y}_{t-K+1}^n)$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n \triangleq (\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-K+1}^n)$; the "bar" symbol in $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n$ indicates that elements of these vectors refer to different time indices.

Proposition 2. *There exist* $\delta > 0$, $\psi < \infty$ *and* n_0 *such that for all* $n \ge n_0$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n)\, 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \notin \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\} - \Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n) \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \le -\delta\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n) + \psi.$$

Proof. On the event $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \notin \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\}$ Lemma 5 renders in a vector form $\hat{Y}_t^n = \hat{V}_t^n - \beta_n + \boldsymbol{p} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n$, and, since $p_i + \tilde{p}_{i+1} = \tilde{p}_i$ by definition, it implies $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n = \hat{V}_t^n - \beta_n + \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n$. Thus, the linear combination of $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n$ that appears in the definition of Ψ_θ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n &= \hat{V}_t^n - \beta_n + \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n \\ &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n - \beta_n + \boldsymbol{K} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where the second equality follows from (32) and (26). Then, based on (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n) 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \notin \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\} \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] - \Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n) \\ &\le 2\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n)\, \mathbb{E}\left[-\beta_n + \boldsymbol{K} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(-\beta_n + \boldsymbol{K} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n\right)^2 \middle| \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Now, by (24) the sum in (36) can be expressed in terms of $\hat{A}_t^n$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ rendering

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{A}_t^n/\mu + \boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{A}_t^n/\mu \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \\ &\le \sup_{a\ge 0}\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{A}_t^n/\mu \,\middle|\, a_{t-1}^n = a\right], \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that A_t^n is conditionally independent of $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ and $(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n)$ given a_{t-1} (the arrival process is renewal). The second expectation on the right-hand side of (36) can be upper bounded by utilizing the the same fact in addition to observation that $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ is conditionally independent of $\hat{A}_t^n$ and $(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n)$ given $\hat{J}_t^n$ – see Corollary 2. These two facts yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(-\beta_n + \boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{A}_t^n/\mu - \beta_n\right)^2 + \left(\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \\ &\le \sup_{a\ge 0}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{A}_t^n/\mu - \beta_n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, a_{t-1}^n = a\right] + \max_{0\le i\le n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, \|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| = i\right] \\ &\le \sup_{a\ge 0}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{A}_t^n/\mu - \beta_n\right)^2 \,\middle|\, a_{t-1}^n = a\right] + \sigma_s^2, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4 and $\|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\| \le n$. The limit (as $n\to\infty$) of the right-hand side of the preceding inequality remains bounded due to the assumption (3) on the arrival process (Section 2.1) and the fact that service times are bounded ($S \le K$).

Combining (36) with (37), (2) and (38) yields the statement of the theorem. □

Lemma 7. *The following inequality holds*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[\Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n)\, 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\}\right] < \infty.$$

In the proof of the lemma the following number-theoretic fact will be utilized. For completeness we provide its proof.

Lemma 8. *Let p and q be two relatively prime numbers. For any $K\in\mathbb{N}$ there exists $k\in\mathbb{N}$ such that any $l\in\{k+1,\dots,k+K\}$ can be represented as $l = i_l p + j_l q$ for some $i_l, j_l \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Since p and q are relatively prime then any $m\in\{1,2,\dots,K\}$ can be represented as $m = i'_n p + j'_n q$ for some possibly negative integers i'_n and j'_n, see e.g. [29, p. 104]. Let $t = \max_m\{i'_n, j'_n\} + 1$ and $k = tp + tq$. Then every $l\in\{k+1,\dots,k+K\}$ is given by $l = i_l p + j_l q$, where $i_l = (t + i'_{l-k})$ and $j_l = (t + j'_{l-k})$. □

Proof of Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{R}_x^k = \{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^K : y_1\ge x,\dots,y_{k-1}\ge x, y_k < x\}$, $1\le k\le K$. It is sufficient to prove the statement of the lemma with $\mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}$ replaced with $\mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}^k$ for an arbitrary $k\in\{1,\dots,K\}$ since $\mathcal{R}_{\beta_n} = \cup_k \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}^k$. The proof is based on demonstrating the following bound for some positive integer m and constants $\{c_i, i=0,\dots,m+k+K\}$, $\{d_i, i=0,\dots,m+k+K\}$ such that for all n

$$\Psi_2(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n)\, 1\left\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}^k\right\} \le \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m+k+K}(c_i + d_i|\hat{V}_{t-i}^n|)\right)^2. \tag{39}$$

Then the statement of the lemma follows from the definition of $\hat{V}_t^n$, Lemma 4 and (3) applied in the unconditioned case; thus, we focus on demonstrating (39).

On event $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}^k\}$ applying Lemma 5 to $\hat{Y}_t^n$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Y}_t^n &= \hat{V}_t^n + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i(\hat{Y}_{t-i}^n - \beta_n) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{K} p_i(\hat{Y}_{t-i}^n - \beta_n)^+ \\ &= \hat{V}_t^n + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} g_i(\hat{V}_{t-i}^n - \beta_n) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{K+k-1} h_i(\hat{Y}_{t-i}^n - \beta_n)^+, \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where the constants g_i's and h_i's can be computed in a recursive fashion: $g_0 = 1$, $g_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} g_j p_{i-j}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$, and $h_i = \sum_{j=(i-K)^+}^{k-1} g_j p_{i-j}$, for $i = k+1, \ldots, K+k-1$. Hence, based on (40), there exist finite g and h such that

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n \leq g \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\hat{V}_{t-i}^n)^+ + h \sum_{i=k+1}^{K+k-1} (\hat{Y}_{t-i}^n)^+. \tag{41}$$

Next, on the event of interest, $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}^k\}$, we upper bound the second sum in (41) in two steps: (i) bound values of $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ on a time interval of lenght K prior to time $(t-k)$ based on $\{\hat{Y}_{t-k}^n < \beta_n\}$, and (ii) obtain a desired bound based on (i). First, consider arbitrary $i_1, i_2 \leq K$ such that $p_{i_1} p_{i_2} > 0$; such a pair of indices exists since $\sigma_s > 0$ (see Section 2.1). By Lemma 8 there exists a sufficiently large m such that every element of $\{m+1, m+2, \ldots, m+K\}$ can be represented as $r_1 i_1 + r_2 i_2$ for some nonnegative integers r_1 and r_2. Invoking the second part of Corollary 3 and $\{\hat{Y}_{t-k}^n < \beta_n\}$ yields the existence of finite r, q and $m \geq K$ such that

$$(\hat{Y}_{t-k-i}^n)^+ \leq r + q \sum_{j=k}^{m+k+K} |\hat{V}_{t-j}^n|,$$

for all $i \in \{m+1, \ldots, m+K\}$; we also used $|x+y| \leq |x| + |y|$ and the fact the elements of the sum are nonnegative. The preceding inequality and the first part of Corollary 3 assure the existence of finite r' and q' such that

$$h \sum_{i=k+1}^{K+k-1} (\hat{Y}_{t-i}^n)^+ \leq r' + q' \sum_{i=k}^{m+k+K} |\hat{V}_{t-i}^n| \tag{42}$$

since each summand on the left-hand side is upper bounded by an expression that appears on the right-hand side with r' and q' replaced by some other finite constants.

Next, combining (41) and (42) provides a bound on $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n$ in terms of $\hat{V}_t^n, \ldots, \hat{V}_{t-m-k-K}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n &\leq g \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\hat{V}_{t-i}^n)^+ + r' + q' \sum_{i=k}^{m+k+K} |\hat{V}_{t-i}^n| \\ &\leq r' + g' \sum_{i=0}^{m+k+K} |\hat{V}_{t-i}^n|, \end{aligned}$$

where g' is finite. Finally, from (26) we have that the absolute value of $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n$ is upper bounded by a linear combination of $|\hat{V}_{t-i}^n|$'s. Then, (39) follows from the preceding bound. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 9. *The following inequality holds*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[-\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t)\, 1\{\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t) < 0\}\right] < \infty.$$

Proof. Lemma 5 renders $\hat{Y}^n_t \geq \hat{V}^n_t$ that leads to

$$\Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}^n_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \tilde{p}_i \hat{V}^n_{t+1-i} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^n_t.$$

The statement follows from the preceding relationship, (25), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (3) and Lemma 4. □

4.4 Geometric Lyapunov function

In this section we introduce a family of Lyapunov functions parameterized by some $\theta > 0$ and prove some of its properties. Given a parameter $\theta > 0$, consider a function $\Phi_\theta(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) : \mathbb{R}^{K+K^2} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$\Phi_\theta(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) \triangleq \exp\left\{\theta\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}\cdot\boldsymbol{y} \,+\, \theta\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{z}\right\}. \tag{43}$$

We first consider Φ_θ as a function of the limiting pair $(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)$, where $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t \triangleq (\hat{Y}_t, \ldots, \hat{Y}_{t-K+1})$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t \triangleq (\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t, \ldots, \hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-K+1})$. The next proposition establishes a negative drift of the Lyapunov function Φ_θ under an assumption $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$. Moreover, θ^*/μ is the critical exponent under which Φ_θ is a geometric Lyapunov function (see Appendix B for the definition). Recall the definition of $\mathcal{R}_x$ from (34).

Proposition 3. *For every $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$ there exists $\delta = \delta_\theta > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)\, 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}_\beta\}\,\middle|\,\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] \leq (1-\delta)\,\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}) \tag{44}$$

and for every $\theta > \theta^*/\mu$ there exists $\delta = \delta_\theta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)\,\middle|\,\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] \geq (1+\delta)\,\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}). \tag{45}$$

Proof. The analysis is similar to the one of Proposition 2. From Lemma 6(i) we have that on the event $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}_\beta\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t + \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t &= \hat{V}_t - \beta + \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t \\ &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1} - \beta + \boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t. \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

This results in

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}_\beta\}\,\middle|\,\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] \\ &\quad= e^{-\theta\beta}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t\right\} 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}_\beta\}\,\middle|\,\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right]\,\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}) \\ &\quad\leq e^{-\theta\beta}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t\right\}\,\middle|\,\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right]\,\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}) \\ &\quad= e^{-\theta\beta}\,\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\theta\hat{A}_t/\mu}\right]\,\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t\right\}\right]\,\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t$, mutual independence of $\hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ as well as their independence of $(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1})$. By definition, r.v. $\hat{A}_t$ is normally distributed with zero mean and variance μc_a^2 and, hence,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\theta \hat{A}_t/\mu}\right] = e^{\theta^2 c_a^2/(2\mu)}. \tag{48}$$

On the other hand, $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ is normal with the covariance matrix $\mu\Sigma = \mu(\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{p}) - \boldsymbol{p}^T\boldsymbol{p})$ (see (12)) where $\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{p})$ is the diagonal matrix defined by $\boldsymbol{p}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t\right)^2 &= \mu \boldsymbol{K}^T(\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{p}) - \boldsymbol{p}^T\boldsymbol{p})\boldsymbol{K} \\ &= \mu\sum_{j=1}^{K} j^2 p_j - \mu\left(\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\boldsymbol{p}\right)^2 = \mu\sigma_s^2,\end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t\right\}\right] = e^{\theta^2 c_s^2/(2\mu)}.$$

Inequality (47), (48) and the preceding equality result in

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}_\beta\} \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] \le e^{-\theta\beta} e^{\theta^2 c_a^2/(2\mu)} e^{\theta^2 c_s^2/(2\mu)} \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}),$$

and (44) then follows provided that

$$-\theta\beta + \theta^2 c_a^2/(2\mu) + \theta^2 c_s^2/(2\mu) < 0,$$

or equivalently $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$. Therefore, the first part of the proposition is established.

The proof of (45) is very similar. We observe from Lemma 6(i) that $\hat{Y}_t \ge \hat{V}_t - \beta + \boldsymbol{p}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}$, regardless of whether $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \in \mathcal{R}_\beta$ or $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1} \notin \mathcal{R}_\beta$. Repeating the analysis for the previous case ($\theta < \theta^*/\mu$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] &\ge e^{-\theta\beta}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t\right\} \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}\right] \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}) \\ &= e^{-\theta\beta + \theta^2 c_a^2/(2\mu) + \theta^2 c_s^2/(2\mu)}\, \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1});\end{aligned}$$

thus, (45) holds provided that $\theta > \theta^*/\mu$. This concludes the proof of the proposition. □

The following analogue of Proposition 3 is needed to establish our third main result, Theorem 3.

Proposition 4. *There exist $\theta > 0, 0 < \delta < 1$ and n_0, such that for all $n \ge n_0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n)\, 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \notin \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\} \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \le (1-\delta)\,\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n). \tag{49}$$

Proof. Repeating the first steps of the proof of Proposition 3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n) 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \notin \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\} \,\Big|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\Big] \\ &\quad= e^{-\theta\beta_n}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n\right\} 1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n \notin \mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\} \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n) \\ &\quad\le e^{-\theta\beta_n}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n\right\} \,\middle|\, \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right] \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n). \qquad (50)\end{aligned}$$

Now, the expectation in (50) can be expressed in terms of $\hat{A}_t^n$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ the following way

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta \boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n\right\}\,|\,\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\hat{A}_t^n/\mu+\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right\}|\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right]. \tag{51}$$

The right-hand side can be upper bounded by utilizing: (i) $\hat{A}_t^n$ is conditionally independent of $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ and $(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n)$ given a_{t-1} since the arrival process is renewal, and (ii) $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ is conditionally independent of $\hat{A}_t^n$ and $(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n)$ given $\hat{J}_t^n$ (see Corollary 2). These two facts and (51) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n\right\}|\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_{t-1}^n\right]&\le\sup_a\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\theta\hat{A}_t^n/\mu}\big|a_{t-1}^n=a\right]\max_{0\le l\le n}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\theta\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n\right\}\big|\|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\|=l\right]\\&\le\sup_a\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\theta\hat{A}_t^n/\mu}\big|a_{t-1}^n=a\right]\left(\mathbb{E}e^{\theta(S-1/\mu)/\sqrt{n}}\right)^n,\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 4. Using a second order Taylor expansion in conjunction with the observation that service times are bounded ($S\le K$), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\mathbb{E}e^{\theta(S-1/\mu)/\sqrt{n}}\right)^n=\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(1+\frac{\theta^2\sigma_s^2}{2n}+o(1/n)\right)^n=e^{\theta^2\sigma_s^2/2}<\infty. \tag{53}$$

Finally, from (53), (52) and (50) we conclude that (49) holds for θ that satisfy

$$(c+\sigma_s^2/2)\theta^2-\beta_n\theta<0,$$

that, in light of $\beta_n\to\beta$, is satisfied for sufficiently small θ. This establishes (49) and concludes the proof. □

The analogue of Lemma 7 for the geometric function applied to the nth and limiting processes is stated next. The proof is very similar to that of Lemma 7, except that the fact that $\hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ are normally distributed is utilized in the limiting case.

Lemma 10. *For every $\theta>0$ the following assertion holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)\,1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}\in\mathcal{R}_\beta\}\right]<\infty.$$

Moreover, under the assumption (16), for every $\theta>0$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n)\,1\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}^n\in\mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}\}\right]<\infty.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 7, it is sufficient to prove the statement of the lemma with $\mathcal{R}_\beta$ replaced with $\mathcal{R}_{\beta_n}^k$ for an arbitrary $k\in\{1,\dots,K\}$. Repeating the steps of the proof of Lemma 7 yields the existence of some positive integer m and constants c_i's, d_i's such that

$$\Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t,\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)\,1\left\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1}\in\mathcal{R}_\beta^k\right\}\le\exp\left\{\sum_{i=0}^{m+k+K}(c_i+d_i|\hat{V}_{t-i}|)\right\}.$$

Then the statement of the lemma follows from the definition of $\hat{V}_t$, the Gaussian distribution of its components and Proposition 7 in the appendix.

The proof of the second inequality is very similar and uses (16) and Lemma 4. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1

The convergence in the statement of the theorem is established by proving the tightness of all relevant random variables. Recall that a sequence of r.v.s $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$ is tight [14, p. 87] if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an x_ε so that

$$\sup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left[X_n \notin (-x_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon]\right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proposition 5. *The sequence $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ is tight with respect to the sequence of probability measures $\{\pi_n, n \geq 1\}$.*

Proof. Theorem 13 can be used to bound the sequence $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ away from $+\infty$. In order to obtain uniform boundedness away from $-\infty$ we utilize the fact that the negative part of $\hat{Y}_t^n$ can be upper bounded by $(\hat{V}_t^n)^-$ according to Lemma 6(i).

From Proposition 2, Lemma 7, Lemma 9 and Theorem 13 it follows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} \Psi_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t^n) < \infty.$$

Applying (26), (3) and Lemma 4 we obtain from (33) in the case $\theta = 1$ that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n < \infty. \tag{54}$$

Next, Lemma 5 implies $\hat{Y}_t^n \geq \hat{V}_t^n$ leading to

$$(\hat{Y}_t^n)^- \leq |\hat{V}_t^n| = \sqrt{(\hat{V}_t^n)^2},$$

which combined with (25), Lemma 4 and (3) yields

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} (\hat{Y}_t^n)^- < \infty. \tag{55}$$

Now, in view of $\tilde{p}_1 = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Y}_t^n &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n - \sum_{2\leq k\leq K} \tilde{p}_k \hat{Y}_{t-k}^n \\ &\leq \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t^n + \sum_{2\leq k\leq K} \tilde{p}_k (\hat{Y}_{t-k}^n)^-, \end{aligned}$$

and it then follows from (54) and (55) that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} \hat{Y}_t^n < \infty.$$

This bound together with (55) and Markov inequality implies the tightness of the sequence $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ with respect to the sequence of distributions $\{\pi_n, n \geq 1\}$. □

For the purposes of the proof of Theorem 1 it is convenient to define a sequence of *stationary* random processes

$$\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n = \left(\hat{Q}_t^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t^n, \hat{A}_t^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n, \hat{J}_t^n, \hat{Y}_t^n, a_t^n\right), t \in \mathbb{R}_+\right\}$$

indexed by n. Assume that $(\hat{Q}_t^n, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t^n, a_t^n)$ (or equivalently the extended process $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n$) is distributed according to π_n for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (see Section 3).

Corollary 4. *For a fixed $t \geq 0$, the sequence $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ is tight with respect to the sequence of probability measures $\{\pi_n, n \geq 1\}$.*

Proof. The tightness of random variables $\{\hat{A}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ follows from (3) and the tightness of $\{\hat{Y}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ is due to Proposition 5. The tightness of $\{\hat{Q}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ then follows from (10), and, thus, (11) implies the tightness of $\{\hat{J}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$. The tightness of $\{\hat{J}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ implies via (8) that $\|\boldsymbol{J}_t^n\|/(\mu n) \to 1$ with probability 1. Recalling that $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n$ conditional on $\hat{J}_t^n$ is independent from all the other r.v.s (Corollary 2), we obtain tightness of the sequence $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$. Finally, applying iteratively (23) of Corollary 2, we obtain the tightness of $\hat{L}_{t,K}^n$, $\hat{L}_{t,K-1}^n$ and $\hat{L}_{t,1}^n$. Tightness of a_t^n follows from the equilibrium assumption of the arrival processes, which implies that $\mathbb{E}a_t^n = (c_{a,n}^2 + 1)/(2\lambda_n) = O(1/n)$, as $n \to \infty$, due to our assumption $c_{a,n} \to c_a < \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof of the corollary. □

The preceding result implies the weak convergence of π_n along some subsequence $\{n_k, k \geq 1\}$ to some limiting probability measure π_* [10, p. 59]. For now let π_* be any such limit measure. Later in this section we establish the uniqueness of π_*. Observe that the tightness of $\{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_t^n, n \geq 1\}$ implies the tightness of $\{(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_t^n, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{t+1}^n), n \geq 1\}$.

Proposition 6. *Let $\{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_t^n, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ be in stationarity and suppose $(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_t^n, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{t+1}^n) \Rightarrow (\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t, \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_{t+1})$, as $n \to \infty$, for some $(\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t, \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_{t+1})$, where $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t = \big(\check{Q}_t, \check{\boldsymbol{L}}_t, \check{A}_t, \check{\boldsymbol{J}}_t, \check{J}_t, \check{Y}_t, \check{a}_t\big)$. Then the r.v.s $\check{A}_{t+1}$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ are independent.*

Proof. By (1) and (7) it follows that $\check{A}_{t+1}$ is equal in distribution to $\hat{A}_{t+1}$. One needs to show that for every real a and $\boldsymbol{b}$

$$\mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \leq a, \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t \leq \boldsymbol{b}] = \mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \leq a]\, \mathbb{P}[\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t \leq \boldsymbol{b}], \tag{56}$$

where for the vector case "$\leq$" is interpreted coordinate-wise. Given a multidimensional r.v. $\boldsymbol{X}$, recall that a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ is defined to be a continuity point if $\mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i] = 0$ for every coordinate i; it is known that the set of continuity points is a dense uncountable set (see [14, Sect. 2.9]). Since distribution functions are right-continuous, it suffices to establish the identity (56) for the case when a and $\boldsymbol{b}$ are continuity points of $\check{A}_{t+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_t$ respectively, as in this case, by density property, we can find a sequence of continuity points $(a_n, \boldsymbol{b}_n) \downarrow (a, \boldsymbol{b})$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, one needs to establish (56) with a and $\boldsymbol{b}$ being continuity points.

The key to the proof is the observation that, conditional on the backward recurrence time a_t^n, r.v.s $\hat{A}_{t+1}^n$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n$ are independent, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \leq a, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \leq \boldsymbol{b}] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \leq a \,|\, a_t^n = z] \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \leq \boldsymbol{b} \,|\, a_t^n = z]\, d\mathbb{P}[a_t^n \leq z].$$

By assumption (1) we have

$$\sup_{z \geq 0} \Big| \mathbb{P}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \leq a \,|\, a_t^n = z] - \mathbb{P}[\hat{A}_{t+1} \leq a] \Big| \leq \varepsilon,$$

for all sufficiently large n. Therefore, for all such n the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \leq a, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \leq \boldsymbol{b}] &\leq (\mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \leq a] + \varepsilon) \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \leq \boldsymbol{b} \,|\, a_t^n = z]\, d\mathbb{P}[a_t^n \leq z] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \leq a]\, \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \leq \boldsymbol{b}] + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\boldsymbol{b}$ is a continuity point of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n$. Then the weak convergence $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \Rightarrow \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \le \boldsymbol{b}] \to \mathbb{P}[\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t \le \boldsymbol{b}]$ as $n \to \infty$, resulting in

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \le a, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \le \boldsymbol{b}] \le \mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \le a]\, \mathbb{P}[\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t \le \boldsymbol{b}] + \varepsilon.$$

Similarly we establish

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \le a, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \le \boldsymbol{b}] \ge \mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \le a]\, \mathbb{P}[\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t \le \boldsymbol{b}] - \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, by the assumed weak convergence one has $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\hat{A}_{t+1}^n \le a, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n \le \boldsymbol{b}] \to \mathbb{P}[\check{A}_{t+1} \le a, \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t \le \boldsymbol{b}]$ as $n \to \infty$ since $(a, \boldsymbol{b})$ is a continuity point of the vector $(\check{A}_{t+1}, \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t)$. Parameter ε is arbitrary and, hence, the assertion of the proposition follows. □

We developed the necessary tools for proving Theorem 1. In the proof, we show the existence of a weak subsequential limit of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n$, as $n \to \infty$, that must correspond to the stationary distribution of the Markov chain corresponding to (13), (14) and (15) (Section 3). In the second part of the proof we argue that a stationary distribution of this Markov chain is unique.

Proof of Theorem 1. (Part I.) By Corollary 4 there exists a subsequence $\{n_k, k \ge 1\}$ along which a weak convergence $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^{n_k}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_{t+1}^{n_k}) \Rightarrow (\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t, \check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_{t+1})$ as $k \to \infty$ takes place [14, Sect. 2.2] for a fixed t and a pair of random vectors $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_\cdot = \big(\check{Q}_\cdot, \check{\boldsymbol{L}}_\cdot, \check{A}_\cdot, \check{\boldsymbol{J}}_\cdot, \check{J}_\cdot, \check{Y}_\cdot, \check{a}_\cdot\big)$. The Continuous Mapping Theorem [10, Sect. 2] yields the following weak limits along $\{n_k, k \ge 1\}$:

$$\left(\hat{Q}_t^{n_k} + \hat{A}_{t+1}^{n_k} + \sum_{j=2}^K \hat{L}_{t,j}^{n_k} - \beta_{n_k}\right)^+ \Rightarrow \left(\check{Q}_t + \check{A}_{t+1} + \sum_{j=2}^K \check{L}_{t,j} - \beta\right)^+,$$

$$\left(\hat{Q}_t^{n_k} + \hat{A}_{t+1}^{n_k}\right) \wedge \left(\beta_{n_k} - \sum_{j=2}^K \hat{L}_{t,j}^{n_k}\right) \Rightarrow \left(\check{Q}_t + \check{A}_{t+1}\right) \wedge \left(\beta - \sum_{j=2}^K \check{L}_{t,j}\right).$$

Then from the preceding and Corollary 2 the following relations follow for the elements of $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_{t+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+1} &= \mathcal{T}\{\check{\boldsymbol{L}}_t\} + \check{\boldsymbol{J}}_{t+1} + \check{J}_{t+1}\boldsymbol{p},\\
\check{Q}_{t+1} &= \left(\check{Q}_t + \check{A}_{t+1} + \sum_{j=2}^K \check{L}_{t,j} - \beta\right)^+,\\
\check{J}_{t+1} &= \left(\check{Q}_t + \check{A}_{t+1}\right) \wedge \left(\beta - \sum_{j=2}^K \check{L}_{t,j}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, note that $\hat{A}_t^n \Rightarrow \hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t^n \Rightarrow \hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. These weak limits are due to central limit theorems for renewal processes [10, p. 154] and vectors in $\mathbb{R}^K$ [9, p. 385], respectively. Moreover, $\hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t$ are independent in addition to the independence of $\check{A}_{t+1}$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ (see Proposition 6). Since π_n is the stationary distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n$, we obtain that the distribution of $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ coincides with a stationary distribution of the Markov chain specified by (13), (14) and (15).

(Part II.) We established in the previous part that every weak subsequential limit $\check{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t^n$ is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t$ defined by (13), (14) and (15). It remains to establish the uniqueness of the stationary measure π_* of $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. The uniqueness of the limit measure implies also the convergence $\pi_n \Rightarrow \pi_*$, using standard results of weak convergence theory [10, p. 59].

The proof of uniqueness uses the framework of Harris chains and Harris recurrence. All of the definitions and results are adopted from [14, Ch. 5]. Recall that the Markov chain $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is a Harris chain if one can identify two (measurable) sets $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{K+1}$ and a probability measure ν concentrated on $\mathcal{B}$ such that for every $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}$

$$\sum_{t\geq 0} \mathbb{P}[(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) \in \mathcal{A} \,|\, (\hat{Q}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_0) = \boldsymbol{x}] > 0,$$

and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}$

$$\inf_{x\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}[(\hat{Q}_{t+1}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+1}) \in \mathcal{C} \,|\, (\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) = \boldsymbol{x}] \geq \varepsilon\nu(\mathcal{C}). \tag{57}$$

Moreover, if these conditions hold for some $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$, and the Markov chain possesses a stationary distribution, then the Markov chain is also mixing, and as a result the stationary distribution is unique (see [14, Theorem 6.8] and the comment on aperiodicity just preceding it). Note that if π is a stationary distribution of $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ then π is also a stationary distribution of $\{(\hat{Q}_{2Kt}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{2Kt}), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. In view of this, (57) can be replaced by

$$\inf_{x\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}[(\hat{Q}_{t+2K}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+2K}) \in \mathcal{C} \,|\, (\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) = \boldsymbol{x}] \geq \varepsilon\nu(\mathcal{C}). \tag{58}$$

Thus, our task of proving the uniqueness of the stationary distribution π_* is reduced to constructing the set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$ satisfying the assumptions above. For this purpose we set

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1} : x_1 = 0, \bigvee_{j=2}^{K+1} |x_j| < \beta/K^2 \right\}.$$

Namely, $(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) \in \mathcal{A}$ implies that the queue length $\hat{Q}_t$ is equal to 0 and each $\hat{L}_{t,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq K$, is upper bounded bounded by β/K^2 in absolute value. We set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$ and claim that $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies the requirements when ν is the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{A}$. For a pair of positive constants c, C define an event $\mathcal{U}$ by

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \bigvee_{i=1}^{K} \hat{A}_{t+i} < -C \right\} \cap \left\{ \bigvee_{i=K+1}^{2K} |\hat{A}_{t+i}| < c \right\}$$

and note that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{U}] > 0$ due to the Gaussian nature of $\hat{A}_t$'s.

First, we show that $\mathbb{P}[(\hat{Q}_{t+2K}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+2K}) \in \mathcal{A} \,|\, (\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) = \boldsymbol{x}] > 0$ for every $\boldsymbol{x}$. To this end, given (13), (14), (15) and $(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) = \boldsymbol{x}$, there exists C large enough so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\hat{Q}_{t+K} = 0, \bigvee_{i=1}^{K} \hat{L}_{t+K,i} < -\beta \,\middle|\, \mathcal{U} \right] > 0. \tag{59}$$

To verify this claim note that (13) implies

$$\hat{L}_{t+K,i} = \sum_{j=i}^{K} \left(\hat{J}_{t+K+i-j,j} + p_j \hat{J}_{t+K+i-j} \right), \tag{60}$$

and that $\mathbb{P}[\vee_{i,j=1}^{K} |\hat{J}_{t+i,j}| \le \varepsilon] > 0$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ due to the normal distribution. Then, by selecting $C > p_K^{-1}(\hat{Q}_t + \sum_{i=1}^{K} |\hat{L}_{t,i}| + \beta + \varepsilon K)$ and ε small enough, recursions (14) and (15) render, on the event $\mathcal{U} \cap \{\vee_{i,j=1}^{K} |\hat{J}_{t+i,j}| \le \varepsilon\}$, to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_{t+1} &= 0, \\ \hat{J}_{t+1} &= \hat{Q}_t + \hat{A}_{t+1} \le -p_K^{-1}(\beta + \varepsilon K), \end{aligned}$$

leading to $\hat{L}_{t+1,K} \le \varepsilon - \beta - \varepsilon K$ by (60). Next, on the same event $\hat{Q}_{t+2} = 0$, $\hat{J}_{t+2} = \hat{A}_{t+2} \le -p_K^{-1}(\beta + \varepsilon K)$, $\hat{L}_{t+2,K} \le -\beta - \varepsilon(K-1)$ and $\hat{L}_{t+2,K-1} \le -\beta - \varepsilon(K-2)$. Further iteration over the time index and (60) yield (59).

In addition, for c small enough in the definition of $\mathcal{U}$, on event $\{\hat{Q}_{t+K} = 0, \vee_i \hat{L}_{t+K,i} < -\beta\}$, we have $Q_{t+K+i} = 0$ and $\hat{J}_{t+K+i} = \hat{A}_{t+K+i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ by a similar argument as above. Then the components $2, \dots, K+1$ of $(\hat{Q}_{t+2K}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+2K})$ are bounded in absolute value by β/K^2 provided that

$$\hat{J}'_i = \sum_{j=i}^{K} \hat{J}_{t+2K+i-j,j} \in \left\{ [-\beta/K^2, \beta/K^2] - \sum_{j=i}^{K} p_j \hat{A}_{t+2K+i-j} \right\}, \tag{61}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, K$. We denote by $\mathcal{E}$ the conjunction of $\mathcal{U}$ and the event described by (61). Recall that $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of multivariate Gaussian random vectors, independent from all other r.v.s, with the covariance matrix Σ (12). Thus, $(\hat{J}'_1, \dots, \hat{J}'_K)$ is a zero-mean multivariate Gaussian vector with $\mathbb{E}\hat{J}'^2_i = \sum_{j=i}^{K}(1-p_j)p_j$ and $\mathbb{E}\hat{J}'_i\hat{J}'_j = -\sum_{k=j}^{K} p_{k+i-j}p_k$, $i < j$. In particular it has a continuous positive density everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^K$. Namely, assume that $(\hat{J}'_i, \hat{J}'_{i+1}, \dots, \hat{J}'_K)$ has a continuous positive density everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^{K+1-i}$; this assumption holds for $i = K$ because $p_K > 0$. Then, $(\hat{J}'_{i-1}, \hat{J}'_i, \dots, \hat{J}'_K)$ has a continuous density everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^{K+2-i}$ since

$$\hat{J}'_{i-1} = \hat{J}_{t+K+i-1,K} + \sum_{j=i-1}^{K-1} \hat{J}_{t+2K+i-1-j,j},$$

$\hat{J}_{t+K+i-1,K}$ is independent of $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_{t+K+j}, j = i, \dots, K\}$ and $(\hat{J}'_i, \hat{J}'_{i+1}, \dots, \hat{J}'_K)$ is a deterministic function of $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}_{t+K+j}, j = i, \dots, K\}$. Clearly then $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E} \,|\, (\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) = \boldsymbol{x}] > 0$ for every $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Second, as in the preceding, by continuity and strict positivity of the density of $\hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{J}'_i$, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for every set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A}$

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}[(\hat{Q}_{t+2K}, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_{t+2K}) \in \mathcal{C} \,|\, (\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t) = \boldsymbol{x}] \ge \alpha \nu(\mathcal{C}),$$

and the requirement (58) holds. Thus $\{(\hat{Q}_t, \hat{\boldsymbol{L}}_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is indeed a Harris chain which admits a unique stationary distribution. This completes the proof. □

6 Proof of Theorem 2

This section is devoted to proving our second main result, Theorem 2. The approach is based on the results of Section 4.4 for the limiting Markov chain $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ in steady state. The proof utilizes the following preparatory lemma. The operators "$\leq$" and "$\geq$" are interpreted element-wise.

Lemma 11. *Let*

$$\Gamma^T = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{p} \\ I \;\; \mathbf{0}^T \end{bmatrix},$$

where I is the $(K-1)\times(K-1)$ identity matrix and $\mathbf{0}$ is a $(K-1)$-dimensional vector of zeros. Then for $t \geq K-1$ and $k \geq 0$

$$-\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+k} - \beta \boldsymbol{B}_k \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t+k} - (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma^k \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+k},$$

where $\boldsymbol{B}_k = (k, (k-1)^+, \ldots, (k-K+1)^+)$ and

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_t = \left(\sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t} |\hat{V}_i|, \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t-1} |\hat{V}_i|, \ldots, \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t-K+1} |\hat{V}_i| \right).$$

Remark 1. Note that Γ^T is an irreducible, aperiodic stochastic matrix since $\|\boldsymbol{p}\| = 1$, $p_K > 0$ and there exist relatively prime i and j such that $p_i p_j > 0$ (see Section 2.1). Therefore, $\Gamma^k \to (\psi^T, \ldots, \psi^T)$ as $k \to \infty$ for some unique probability vector ψ.

Proof. The proof is by induction over k. First, we claim that the statement holds for $k = 0$:

$$-\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_t - \beta \boldsymbol{B}_0 \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t - (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_t,$$

or in the scalar form

$$-\sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t-j} |\hat{V}_i| \leq \hat{Y}_{t-j} - (\hat{Y}_{t-j})^+ \leq \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t-j} |\hat{V}_i|,$$

where $j = 0, 1, \ldots, K-1$. The upper bound is trivial due to the nonnegativity of $|\hat{V}_i|$ for all i; the same holds for the lower bound when $\hat{Y}_{t-j} \geq 0$. The case $\hat{Y}_{t-j} < 0$ is covered by Lemma 6(i) since it implies $\hat{Y}_{t-j} \geq \hat{V}_{t-j}$. Now, assume that the statement holds for some k and note that

$$(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i \hat{Y}^+_{t+1-i}, \hat{Y}^+_t, \hat{Y}^+_{t-1}, \ldots, \hat{Y}^+_{t-K+2} \right),$$

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_t \Gamma \leq \left(\sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t} |\hat{V}_i|, \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t} |\hat{V}_i|, \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t-1} |\hat{V}_i|, \ldots, \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t-K+2} |\hat{V}_i| \right).$$

Consider the upper bound first. The preceding two relationships, Lemma 6(i) and the inductive assumption yield

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t+k+1} &\leq (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t+k})^+ \Gamma + (|\hat{V}_{t+k+1}|, 0, \ldots, 0) \\ &\leq (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma^{k+1} + \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+k} \Gamma + (|\hat{V}_{t+k+1}|, 0, \ldots, 0) \\ &\leq (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma^{k+1} + \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(x-\beta)^+ \le x^+$ is also used. As far as the lower bound is concerned, the same arguments and $(x-\beta)^+ \ge x^+ - \beta$ result in

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t+k+1} &\ge (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t+k})^+ \Gamma - (|\hat{V}_{t+k+1}| + \beta, 0, \ldots, 0) \\ &\ge (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma^{k+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+k}\Gamma - \beta \boldsymbol{B}_k \Gamma - (|\hat{V}_{t+k+1}| + \beta, 0, \ldots, 0) \\ &\ge (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma^{k+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+k+1} - \beta \boldsymbol{B}_{k+1}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We conclude this section with the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Proposition 3, Lemma 10 and Theorem 12, where in the theorem each Ξ^n is identified with $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\pi_n = \pi_*$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\beta_n} = \mathcal{R}_\beta$, yield

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*} \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) < \infty \tag{62}$$

for every $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$. On the other hand, taking expectation (with respect to π_*) of both sides of (45) implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*} \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) = \infty \tag{63}$$

for every $\theta > \theta^*/\mu$.

Next, the definition (43) of Φ_θ renders $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t = \theta^{-1} \log \Phi_\theta(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t, \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) - \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t$. This equality, (62), (63), the normal distribution of $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t$ and Proposition 8 of the appendix result in

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*} \exp\{\theta \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t\} < \infty \tag{64}$$

for every $\theta < \theta^*/\mu$ while

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*} \exp\{\theta \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t\} = \infty \tag{65}$$

for every $\theta > \theta^*/\mu$. Given (64) and (65), in order to complete the proof of the theorem it is sufficient to prove for every $\theta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_*} \exp\{\theta |\mu^{-1} \hat{Y}_t - \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t|\} < \infty, \tag{66}$$

or equivalently $|\mu^{-1}\hat{Y}_t - \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t| \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$ assuming the stationarity of $\{\hat{Y}_t,\, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Informally, (66) implies that the stationary r.v.s $\mu^{-1}\hat{Y}_t$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t$ have the same exponential decay rate.

The rest of the proof is devoted to establishing (66). Given that $\mu^{-1}\hat{Y}_t = \sum_k \tilde{p}_k \hat{Y}_t$, by Proposition 7 of the appendix it suffices to show that $|\hat{Y}_t - \hat{Y}_{t-k}| \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$ for every $k = 1, \ldots, K-1$ and stationary $\{\hat{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Consider an arbitrary such k and note that Lemma 11 renders, for $j \ge 1$ and $t \ge K-1$,

$$-\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+j} - \beta \boldsymbol{B}_j \le \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t+j} - (\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t)^+ \Gamma^j \le \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}_{t+j}.$$

Rewriting the preceding relationship in a scalar form renders

$$\begin{aligned} -\sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t+j} |\hat{V}_i| - j\beta \le \hat{Y}_{t+j} - \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} (\Gamma^j)_{i+1,1} \hat{Y}^+_{t-i} \le \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t+j} |\hat{V}_i|, \\ -\sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t+j-k} |\hat{V}_i| - (j-k)^+\beta \le \hat{Y}_{t+j-k} - \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} (\Gamma^j)_{i+1,k+1} \hat{Y}^+_{t-i} \le \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t+j-k} |\hat{V}_i|, \end{aligned}$$

and, hence,

$$|\hat{Y}_{t+j} - \hat{Y}_{t+j-k}| \le \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} |(\Gamma^j)_{i+1,1} - (\Gamma^j)_{i+1,k+1}| \hat{Y}^+_{t-i} + 2 \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t+j} |\hat{V}_i| + 2(j+K+1)\beta. \tag{67}$$

In view of Remark 1, the speed of convergence of Γ^k in k is exponential [12, p. 211], i.e., there exist constants C and $\gamma < 1$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \le i \le K-1} |(\Gamma^j)_{i+1,1} - (\Gamma^j)_{i+1,k+1}| \le C\gamma^j.$$

Then, (67) and the preceding inequality yield

$$|\hat{Y}_{t+j} - \hat{Y}_{t+j-k}| \le C\gamma^j \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \hat{Y}^+_{t-i} + 2 \sum_{i=t-K+1}^{t+j} |\hat{V}_i| + 2(j+K+1)\beta. \tag{68}$$

Now, observe that the last two terms on the right-hand side of the preceding inequality are elements of $\mathcal{M}_\infty$ due to (30), (31), and Proposition 7. In addition, from $\hat{Y}_t = \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t - \sum_{i=2}^K \tilde{p}_i \hat{Y}_{t-i+1}$ (Lemma 6(i)), (64), Lemma 6(ii) and Proposition 7, it follows that $\hat{Y}_t \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$ for some sufficiently small $\theta' > 0$. By stationarity of $\{\hat{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ this applies to every term in the first sum on the right-hand side of (68). It then follows that $|\hat{Y}_t - \hat{Y}_{t-k}| \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta''}$ with $\theta'' = \gamma^{-j}\theta'/(CK)$. Since j is arbitrary, by taking it sufficiently large we establish $|\hat{Y}_t - \hat{Y}_{t-k}| \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$. This concludes the proof of (66) and the proof of the theorem. □

7 Proof of Theorem 3

Proposition 4, the second part of Lemma 10 and Theorem 12 from the Appendix imply the statement of the theorem.

8 Proof of Corollary 1

First, we note that for $x \ge 0$, as $n \to \infty$,

$$A^n_{0,x/\sqrt{n}}/\sqrt{n} \to \mu x \tag{69}$$

in probability. Let $\{\tau_{n,i}, i \ge 1\}$ be interarrival times in the nth system, with $\tau_{n,1}$ being the time of the first arrival after time $t = 0$. The limit is based on the following: (i) $\{A_{0,t} \ge k\} = \{\sum_{i=1}^k \tau_{n,i} \le t\}$ for $t \ge 0$, $k \ge 1$; (ii) for n large enough Markov's inequality yields for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{\lfloor(\mu x+\varepsilon)\sqrt{n}\rfloor} \tau_{n,i} \le x/\sqrt{n}\right] &\le \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{\lfloor(\mu x+\varepsilon)\sqrt{n}\rfloor} (\tau_{n,i} - 1/\lambda_n) \le -2\varepsilon/(\mu\sqrt{n})\right] \\ &\le \mu^2(\mu x+\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-2} n^{3/2} \mathrm{Var}(\tau_{n,2}) \to 0\end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{\lceil(\mu x-\varepsilon)\sqrt{n}\rceil} \tau_{n,i} > x/\sqrt{n}\right] \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$; and (iii) the arrival processes are in stationarity and, thus, $\tau_{n,1}$ has the equilibrium distribution and does not impact (69).

Second, from the Distributional Little's Law [21] it follows that Q^n equals in distribution to the number of arrivals in a renewal process A^n_t during the time interval of length W^n (recall that $\{A^n_t, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is in stationarity), i.e., $Q^n = A^n_{0,W^n}$ in distribution. Then for every $x > 0$, the event $\{W^n \le x\}$ implies $\{Q^n \le A^n_{0,x}\}$ and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\sqrt{n}W^n \le x] &\le \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}\left[Q^n \le A^n_{0,x/\sqrt{n}}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}\left[Q^n/\sqrt{n} \le A^n_{0,x/\sqrt{n}}/\sqrt{n}\right].\end{aligned}$$

The distribution of $\hat{Q}$ is continuous everywhere on $(0,\infty)$ as seen from the presence of $\hat{A}_{t+1}$ in the expression for $\hat{Q}_{t+1}$ in (14). Letting $n \to \infty$ in the preceding inequality and applying (69) yields

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\sqrt{n}W^n \le x] \le \mathbb{P}_{\pi_*}[\hat{Q} \le \mu x].$$

Similarly, for every $x > 0$, the event $\{W^n > x\}$ implies $\{Q^n \ge A^n_{0,x}\}$, leading to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\sqrt{n}W^n > x] &\le \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}\left[Q^n \ge A^n_{0,x/\sqrt{n}}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}\left[Q^n/\sqrt{n} \ge A^n_{0,x/\sqrt{n}}/\sqrt{n}\right]\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\sqrt{n}W^n \le x] \ge \mathbb{P}_{\pi_*}[\hat{Q} \le \mu x].$$

The preceding establishes $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}[\sqrt{n}W^n \le x] \to \mathbb{P}_{\pi_*}[\hat{Q} \le \mu x]$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $x > 0$. The assertion then follows.

9 Conclusions

We analyzed a stationary multi-server queue in the Halfin-Whitt (QED) regime when the service times have a lattice-valued distribution with a finite support. Prior analyses of such systems in steady-state assumed either exponential or deterministic service times. We described the steady-state distribution of the appropriately scaled queue length in terms of the steady-state distribution of a continuous-state Markov chain. One can estimate the steady-state distribution of this chain either numerically or by simulations. Finally, we have established that the large deviations rate of the queue length in steady state is given by $\theta^* = 2\beta/(c_a^2 + c_s^2)$, where β is the extra capacity parameter of the model and c_a, c_s are the coefficients of variation of interarrival and service times, respectively. We conjecture that the expression for θ^* remains valid for a broad class of service time distributions.

Acknowledgment

PM thanks Itay Gurvich and Avishai Mandelbaum for discussions on the QED regime.

References

[1] Z. Aksin, M. Armony, and V. Mehrotra. The modern call center: A multi-disciplinary perspective on operations management research. *Production and Operations Management*, 16(6): 665-668, 2007.

[2] M. Armony and C. Maglaras. Contact centers with a call-back option and real-time delay information. *Oper. Res.*, 52(4):527–545, 2004.

[3] M. Armony and C. Maglaras. On customer contact centers with a call-back option: Customer decisions, sequencing rules, and system design. *Oper. Res.*, 52(2):271–292, 2004.

[4] S. Asmussen. *Applied Probability and Queues*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2nd edition, 2003.

[5] R. Atar. A diffusion model of scheduling control in queueing systems with many servers. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(1B):820–852, 2005.

[6] R. Atar. Scheduling control for queueing systems with many servers: Asymptotic optimality in heavy traffic. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(4):2606–2650, 2005.

[7] R. Atar, A. Mandelbaum, and M. Reiman. Scheduling a multi class queue with many exponential servers: Asymptotic optimality in heavy traffic. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(3):1084–1134, 2004.

[8] F. Baccelli and P. Bremaud. *Elements of Queueing Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2nd edition, 2003.

[9] P. Billingsley. *Probability and Measure*. Wiley, 3rd edition, 1995.

[10] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2nd edition, 1999.

[11] S. Borst, A. Mandelbaum, and M. Reiman. Dimensioning of large call centers. *Oper. Res.*, 52(1):17–34, 2004.

[12] P. Bremaud. *Markov Chains: Gibbs Fields, Monte Carlo Simulation, and Queues*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[13] K. L. Chung. *A Course in Probability Theory*. Academic Press, 2nd edition, 1974.

[14] R. Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Thomson, 3rd edition, 2005.

[15] A.K. Erlang. On the rational determination of the number of circuits. In E. Brockmeyer, H.L. Halstrom, and A. Jensen, editors, *The life and works of A.K. Erlang*. The Copenhagen Telephone Company, Copenhagen, 1948.

[16] P. Fleming, A. Stolyar, and B. Simon. Heavy traffic limit for a mobile phone system loss model. In *Proc. of 2nd Int'l Conf. on Telecomm. Syst. Mod. and Analysis*, Nashville, TN, 1994.

[17] D. Gamarnik and A. Zeevi. Validity of heavy traffic steady-state approximations in open queueing networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(1):56–90, 2006.

[18] N. Gans, G. Koole, and A. Mandelbaum. Telephone call centers: Tutorial, review, and research prospects. *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management*, 5(2):79–141, 2003.

[19] O. Garnett, A. Mandelbaum, and M. Reiman. Designing a call center with impatient customers. *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management*, 4(3):208–227, 2002.

[20] I. Gurvich, M. Armony, and A. Mandelbaum. Service level differentiation in call centers with fully flexible servers. *Management Science*, to appear.

[21] R. Haji and G. Newell. A relationship between stationary queue and waiting time distributions. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 8:617–620, 1971.

[22] S. Halfin and W. Whitt. Heavy-traffic limits for queues with many exponential servers. *Oper. Res.*, 29(3):567–588, 1981.

[23] J.M. Harrison and A. Zeevi. Dynamic scheduling of a multiclass queue in the Halfin-Whitt heavy traffic regime. *Oper. Res.*, 52(2):243–257, 2004.

[24] D. Jagerman. Some properties of the Erlang loss function. *Bell System Techn. J.*, 53(3):525–551, 1974.

[25] P. Jelenković, A. Mandelbaum, and P. Momčilović. Heavy traffic limits for queues with many deterministic servers. *Queueing Syst. Theory Appl.*, 47(1-2):53–69, 2004.

[26] J. Kiefer and J. Wolfowitz. On the theory of queues with many servers. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 78:1–18, 1955.

[27] J.F.C. Kingman. The single server queue in heavy traffic. *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, 57:902–904, 1961.

[28] J.F.C. Kingman. The heavy traffic approximation in the theory of queues. In W.L. Smith and R.I. Wilkinson, editors, *Proc. Symp. on Congestion Theory*, pages 137–169, Chapel Hill, NC, 1964.

[29] P. Lovasz, J. Pelikan, and K. Vesztergombi. *Discrete Mathematics: Elementary and Beyond*. Springer, New York, NY, 2003.

[30] C. Maglaras and A. Zeevi. Pricing and capacity sizing for systems with shared resources: Approximate solutions and scaling relations. *Management Science*, 49(8):1018–1038, 2003.

[31] A. Mandelbaum and P. Momčilović. Queues with many servers: The virtual waiting-time process in the QED regime. *Math. Oper. Res.*, to appear.

[32] A. Mandelbaum and S. Zeltyn. Staffing many-server queues with impatient customers: Constraint satisfaction in call centers. Preprint, 2006.

[33] S.P. Meyn and R.L. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Springer-Verlag, London, UK, 1993.

[34] A. Puhalskii. On the invariance principle for the first passage time. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 19(4):946–954, 1994.

[35] A. Puhalskii and M. Reiman. The multiclass GI/PH/N queue in the Halfin-Whitt regime. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 32(3):564–595, 2000.

[36] J. Reed. The G/GI/N queue in the Halfin-Whitt regime. Preprint, 2007.

[37] T. Tezcan. Optimal control of distributed parallel server systems under the Halfin and Whitt regime. *Math. Oper. Res.*, to appear.

[38] W. Whitt. *Stochastic-Process Limits*. Springer, New York, 2002.

[39] W. Whitt. A diffusion approximation for the G/GI/n/m queue. *Oper. Res.*, 52(6):922–941, 2004.

[40] W. Whitt. Heavy-traffic limits for the $G/H_2^*/n/m$ queue. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 30(1):1–27, 2005.

[41] S. Zeltyn and A. Mandelbaum. Call centers with impatient customers: Many-server asymptotics of the M/M/n+G queue. *Queueing Syst. Theory Appl.*, 51(3-4):361–402, 2005.

A Appendix A: Moment generating functions

Here we list some basic properties of moment generating functions. While these properties are well known, we include the proofs for completeness.

Proposition 7. *Any affine combination of (not necessarily independent) nonnegative elements of $\mathcal{M}_\infty$ is an element of $\mathcal{M}_\infty$.*

Proof. Given two sequences $\{X_1^n, n \geq 1\}$, $\{X_2^n, n \geq 1\} \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$ of nonnegative r.v.s, and reals a, a_1, a_2 and $\theta > 0$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$M^2_{a+a_1X_1^n+a_2X_2^n}(\theta) \leq e^{\theta a} M_{X_1^n}(2\theta)\, M_{X_2^n}(2\theta). \tag{70}$$

The definition of $\mathcal{M}_\infty$ and nonnegativity of X_j^n, $j = 1, 2$, render $\limsup_{n\to\infty} M_{X_j^n}(x) < \infty$, for all x, positive or negative. It then follows that the lim sup of the product on the right-hand side of (70) is finite. The proof for the general case is obtained by induction. □

Proposition 8. *Suppose $\{X^n, n \geq 1\} \in \mathcal{M}_\theta$ for some $\theta > 0$ and $\{Y^n, n \geq 1\} \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$. Then $\{X^n + Y^n, n \geq 1\} \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$ for every $\theta' < \theta$.*

Proof. Applying Hölder's inequality $\mathbb{E}[XY] \leq (\mathbb{E}[X^p])^{1/p}(\mathbb{E}[Y^q])^{1/q}$ with parameters $p = \theta/\theta'$ and $q = \theta/(\theta - \theta')$, defined from $1/q = 1 - 1/p$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\theta'(X^n+Y^n)} \leq \left(\mathbb{E}e^{\theta X^n}\right)^{\theta'/\theta} \left(\mathbb{E}e^{\theta Y^n/(\theta-\theta')}\right)^{1-\theta'/\theta}.$$

The statement follows. □

B Appendix B: Lyapunov functions

The following definition plays a key role in the proofs of our main results.

Definition 1. (Geometric Lyapunov function) *Let $\Xi = \{\Xi_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ be a discrete-time Markov chain defined on a state space $\mathcal{X}$, equipped with a σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$. A function $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined to be a geometric Lyapunov function for Ξ with a geometric drift size $0 < \delta < 1$ and exception set $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{X}$ if for every $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi(\Xi_1)|\Xi_0 = x] \leq (1 - \delta)\Phi(x).$$

(Quadratic Lyapunov function) *Under the same setting as above, a function $\Psi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined to be a quadratic Lyapunov function for Ξ with exception set $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and parameters $\delta > 0$, $0 \leq \psi < \infty$ if for every $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Psi^2(\Xi_1)|\Xi_0 = x] - \Psi^2(x) \leq -\delta\Psi(x) + \psi.$$

Informally, the following result shows that if a sequence of Markov chains admits the same geometric Lyapunov function that is uniformly bounded in expectation in the exception region, then this function is uniformly bounded in expectation in general. Our definition of a geometric Lyapunov function as well as the following result is fairly standard [17, 33].

Theorem 12. *Let $\{\Xi^n, n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of discrete-time Markov chains with $\mathcal{X}_n$ and π_n being the state space and a stationary distribution of Ξ^n, respectively. Suppose for every $n \geq 1$ function $\Phi : \cup\mathcal{X}_n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a geometric Lyapunov function for Ξ^n with drift δ and exception set $\mathcal{R}_n \subset \mathcal{X}_n$. If*

$$C_{\mathcal{R}} \triangleq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} \left[\Phi(\Xi_1^n) 1\{\Xi_0^n \in \mathcal{R}_n\}\right] < \infty \tag{71}$$

then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\Phi(\Xi_1^n)] \leq C_{\mathcal{R}}/\delta.$$

Remark 2. Note that the uniqueness of a stationary distribution π_n is not assumed. The theorem holds for *every* sequence of stationary distributions.

Remark 3. Our treatment of the geometric Lyapunov function is unconventional. Typically it is assumed that in the exception region the jumps $\Phi(\Xi_1^n) - \Phi(\Xi_0^n)$ are deterministically bounded, e.g., see [33]. The intuition behind our result is as follows. The expected value of the Lyapunov function is uniformly bounded (in n) since (i) when the chain is in the exception region Φ is bounded by assumption (in the next time step), and (ii) when the chain is outside of the exception region there is a downward uniform drift decreasing the expected value of Φ.

Proof. The proof is similar to the approach taken in [17], and it is based on the Monotone Convergence Theorem. Assumption (71) implies the existence of n_0 such that $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\Phi(\Xi_1^n)1\{\Xi_0^n \in \mathcal{R}_n\}] < \infty$ for all $n > n_0$. Fix an arbitrary such n, introduce the following two conditional expectations

$$\begin{aligned} G^b(x) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\Phi(\Xi_1^n) \wedge b \,\middle|\, \Xi_0^n = x\right], \\ H(x) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\Phi(\Xi_1^n) 1\{\Xi_0^n \in \mathcal{R}_n\} \,\middle|\, \Xi_0^n = x\right] \end{aligned}$$

and let $G(x) = G^\infty(x)$ for notational simplicity. Then, by the Lyapunov nature of Φ, the difference of $G(x)$ and $\Phi(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ can be bounded as

$$G(x) - \Phi(x) \leq \begin{cases} -\delta\Phi(x), & x \in \mathcal{X}_n \setminus \mathcal{R}_n, \\ H(x) - \Phi(x), & x \in \mathcal{R}_n, \end{cases}$$

the second case being in fact the equality. Due to the nonnegativity of $H(\cdot)$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$, the two cases in the preceding inequality can be combined into

$$G(x) - \Phi(x) \leq -\delta\Phi(x) + H(x), \tag{72}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$; recall that $0 < \delta < 1$ by Definition 1. Furthermore, the preceding inequality, $G^b(x) \leq b$ (by definition) and the nonnegativity of $H(\cdot)$ yield

$$G^b(x) - \Phi(x) \wedge b \leq H(x), \tag{73}$$

$x \in \mathcal{X}_n$; the validity of the inequality can be verified by considering separately the cases $\Phi(x) < b$ and $\Phi(x) \geq b$. Then, (73) implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[G^b(\Xi_0^n) - \Phi(\Xi_0^n) \wedge b] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[H(\Xi_0^n)] < \infty, \tag{74}$$

where the strict inequality is due to the choice of $n > n_0$.

Now, the Monotone Convergence Theorem renders $\{G^b(x) - \Phi(x) \wedge b\} \to \{G(x) - \Phi(x)\}$ as $b \to \infty$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$. Using the Fatou's lemma, applicable due to (74) (see also [13, p. 44]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[G(\Xi_0^n) - \Phi(\Xi_0^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[\lim_{b\to\infty}\left\{G^b(\Xi_0^n) - \Phi(\Xi_0^n) \wedge b\right\}\right] \\ &\geq \limsup_{b\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[G^b(\Xi_0^n) - \Phi(\Xi_0^n) \wedge b\right] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

where the last equality follows from the stationary nature of the distribution π_n.

Finally, (72) and (75) result in

$$-\delta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} \Phi(\Xi_0^n) + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} H(\Xi_0^n) \geq 0,$$

and the conclusion of the theorem follows since this inequality holds for every $n > n_0$. □

Theorem 13. *Let $\{\Xi^n, n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of discrete-time Markov chains with $\mathcal{X}_n$ and π_n being the state space and a stationary distribution of Ξ^n, respectively. Suppose for every $n \geq 1$ function $\Psi : \cup\mathcal{X}_n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi^2(\Xi_1^n)1\{\Xi_0^n \notin \mathcal{R}_n\} - \Psi^2(\Xi_0^n) \,\middle|\, \Xi_0^n\right] \leq -\delta\Psi(\Xi_0^n) + \psi \tag{76}$$

for some $\delta > 0$, $0 \leq \psi < \infty$ and $\mathcal{R}_n \subset \mathcal{X}_n$. If

$$C_{\mathcal{R}} \triangleq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[\Psi^2(\Xi_1^n)1\{\Xi_0^n \in \mathcal{R}_n\}\right] < \infty \tag{77}$$

and

$$C_0 \triangleq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[-\Psi(\Xi_0^n)1\{\Psi(\Xi_0^n) < 0\}\right] < \infty \tag{78}$$

then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n} \Psi(\Xi_1^n) \leq (C_{\mathcal{R}} + C_0 + \psi)/\delta.$$

Remark 4. A non-standard part of our definition of the quadratic Lyapunov function is allowing Ψ to be negative. Our second result in this section shows that if a sequence of Markov chains admits the same quadratic Lyapunov function that is uniformly bounded in expectation in the exception region, then the (linear part of this) function is uniformly bounded away from $+\infty$.

Proof. The proofs of Theorems 12 and 13 are similar. Assumptions (77) and (78) imply the existence of n_0 such that $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[\Psi^2(\Xi_1^n)1\{\Xi_0^n \in \mathcal{R}_n\} - \Psi(\Xi_0^n)1\{\Psi(\Xi_0^n) < 0\}] < \infty$ for all $n > n_0$. Fix an arbitrary such n, introduce the following two conditional expectations

$$\begin{aligned} G^b(x) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\Psi^2(\Xi_1^n) \wedge b \,\middle|\, \Xi_0^n = x\right], \\ H(x) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\Psi^2(\Xi_1^n)1\{\Xi_0^n \in \mathcal{R}_n\} \,\middle|\, \Xi_0^n = x\right] \end{aligned}$$

and let $G(x) = G^\infty(x)$ for notational simplicity. Then, by (76) the difference of $G(x)$ and $\Psi^2(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ can be bounded as

$$G(x) - \Psi^2(x) \leq -\delta\Psi(x) + \psi + H(x). \tag{79}$$

Furthermore, the preceding inequality, $G^b(x) \leq b$ (by definition) and the nonnegativity of $H(\cdot)$ yield

$$G^b(x) - \Psi^2(x) \wedge b \leq -\delta\Psi(x)1\{\Psi(x) < 0\} + \psi + H(x), \tag{80}$$

$x \in \mathcal{X}_n$; the validity of the inequality can be verified by considering separately the cases $\Psi^2(x) < b$ and $\Psi^2(x) \geq b$. Then, (80) implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[G^b(\Xi_0^n) - \Phi(\Xi_0^n) \wedge b] \leq \delta\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[-\Psi(\Xi_0^n)1\{\Psi(\Xi_0^n) < 0\}\right] + \psi + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}[H(\Xi_0^n)] < \infty, \tag{81}$$

where the strict inequality is due to the choice of $n > n_0$.

Now, the Monotone Convergence Theorem renders $\{G^b(x) - \Psi^2(x) \wedge b\} \to \{G(x) - \Psi^2(x)\}$ as $b \to \infty$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$. Using the Fatou's lemma, applicable due to (81), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[G(\Xi_0^n) - \Psi^2(\Xi_0^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[\lim_{b\to\infty}\left\{G^b(\Xi_0^n) - \Psi^2(\Xi_0^n) \wedge b\right\}\right] \\ &\geq \limsup_{b\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\left[G^b(\Xi_0^n) - \Psi^2(\Xi_0^n) \wedge b\right] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

where the last equality follows from the stationary nature of the distribution π_n.

Finally, (79) and (82) result in

$$-\delta\mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}\Psi(\Xi_0^n) + \psi + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_n}H(\Xi_0^n) \geq 0,$$

and the conclusion of the theorem follows since this inequality holds for every $n > n_0$. □